On the optimal control of non-expansive or passive systems

Timothy H. Hughes

arXiv:1703.08153v1 [cs.SY] 23 Mar 2017

***Abstract*—The bounded-real and positive-real lemmas solve two important linear-quadratic optimal control problems related to the concepts of non-expansive and passive systems, respectively. The lemmas assume controllability, yet a non-expansive or passive system can be uncontrollable. In this paper, we solve these optimal control problems without assuming controllability. We obtain necessary and sufficient conditions for a system to be non-expansive (passive) which augment the bounded-real (positive-real) condition with new conditions relating to the uncontrollable modes of the system. A characterisation of the set of solutions to the linear matrix inequalities in the bounded-real and positive-real lemmas is obtained.**

***Index Terms*—Passive, non-expansive, optimal control, positive-real, bounded-real, controllability, observability.**

I. Introduction

The bounded-real and positive-real lemmas are recognised as two of the most fundamental results in systems and control theory. They relate to two important linear-quadratic optimal control problems, which capture the notions of non-expansive and passive systems, respectively [1]–[3]. In the positive-real lemma, the solution to the optimal control problem provides a least upper bound on the energy which can be extracted from a passive system. The two lemmas also provide results on the solutions of important classes of linear matrix inequalities (LMIs) and algebraic Riccati equations (AREs), the theory of spectral factorization, and the concepts of bounded-real and positive-real transfer functions. However, the classical versions of these lemmas consider only controllable systems.

In [4], it was emphasised that there is no physical basis for assuming controllability when studying passive systems: a passive system can be uncontrollable. In that paper, a theory of passive linear systems was developed which does not assume controllability. In contrast to other papers on this subject (see [5, Section 3.3]), that paper did not introduce any alternative assumptions. However, it did not consider the related linear-quadratic optimal control problem, nor did it provide a comprehensive treatment of non-expansive systems. It is the purpose of this paper to solve the optimal control problems considered in the bounded-real and positive-real lemmas in the absence of any assumptions. In so doing, we obtain a characterisation of the set of solutions to the LMIs in these two lemmas. In contrast with the case of controllable systems, we show that for there to exist a solution to the LMI in the bounded-real lemma, and for a system to be non-expansive, it is necessary *but not sufficient* for the $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ norm of the system's transfer function to be bounded above by one. We also provide a necessary and sufficient condition, by introducing two new conditions relating to the uncontrollable modes of the system.

The paper is structured as follows. In Section III, we review the classical bounded-real lemma, we introduce the associated optimal control problem and the concept of a non-expansive system, and we state our main results concerning the solution to this optimal control problem (Theorems 6–8). In particular, we define the new concept of a *bounded-real pair* of polynomial matrices, which forms the basis of our new necessary and sufficient condition for a system to be non-expansive. Also, we obtain an explicit characterisation of the solution to the optimal control problem in terms of an ARE (relevant when the transfer function G satisfies $\lim_{\xi\to\infty}(I-G(-\xi)^TG(\xi))>0$), and a spectral factorization of $I-G(-\xi)^TG(\xi)$ (relevant in the general case). Section IV contains analogous results of relevance to passive systems (Theorems 10–13). The rest of the paper contains the proofs of these results.

II. Notation and preliminaries

The notation in the paper is as follows. $\mathbb{R}$ ($\mathbb{C}$) denotes the real (complex) numbers; $\mathbb{C}_+$ ($\bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$) denotes the open (closed) right-half plane; $\mathbb{C}_-$ ($\bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$) denotes the open (closed) left-half plane. If $\lambda\in\mathbb{C}$, then $\Re(\lambda)$ ($\Im(\lambda)$) denotes its real (imaginary) part, and $\bar{\lambda}$ its complex conjugate. $\mathbb{R}[\xi]$ ($\mathbb{R}(\xi)$) denotes the polynomials (rational functions) in the indeterminate ξ with real coefficients. $\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ (resp., $\mathbb{C}^{m\times n}$, $\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}[\xi]$, $\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}(\xi)$) denotes the $m\times n$ matrices with entries from $\mathbb{R}$ (resp., $\mathbb{C}$, $\mathbb{R}[\xi]$, $\mathbb{R}(\xi)$). If $H\in\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$, $\mathbb{C}^{m\times n}$, $\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}[\xi]$, or $\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}(\xi)$, then H^T denotes its transpose, and if H is nonsingular (i.e., $\det(H)\neq 0$) then H^{-1} denotes its inverse. $\mathbb{R}_s^{n\times n}$ denotes the real $n\times n$ symmetric matrices. The block column (block diagonal) matrix with entries $H_1,\ldots,H_n$ is denoted $\mathrm{col}(H_1\ \cdots\ H_n)$ ($\mathrm{diag}(H_1\ \cdots\ H_n)$). If $M\in\mathbb{C}^{m\times m}$, then $M>0$ ($M\geq 0$) indicates that M is Hermitian positive (non-negative) definite, and $\mathrm{spec}(M):=\{\lambda\mid\det(\lambda I-M)=0\}$.

A $V\in\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}[\xi]$ is called *unimodular* if its determinant is a non-zero constant (equivalently, $V^{-1}\in\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}[\xi]$). The matrices $P\in\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}[\xi]$ and $Q\in\mathbb{R}^{m\times q}[\xi]$ are called *left coprime* if $\mathrm{rank}\begin{bmatrix}P & -Q\end{bmatrix}(\lambda)$ is the same for all $\lambda\in\mathbb{C}$.

If $G\in\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}(\xi)$, then (i) $\mathrm{normalrank}(G):=\max_{\lambda\in\mathbb{C}}(\mathrm{rank}(G(\lambda)))$; (ii) $G^\star(\xi):=G(-\xi)^T$; and (iii) G is

Timothy H. Hughes is with the Department of Engineering, University of Cambridge, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, UK, CB2 1PZ, e-mail: thh22@cam.ac.uk.

This research was conducted while the author was the Henslow research fellow at Fitzwilliam College, University of Cambridge, UK, supported by the Cambridge Philosophical Society, http://www.cambridgephilosophicalsociety.org.

This work has been submitted to the IEEE for possible publication. Copyright may be transferred without notice, after which this version may no longer be accessible.

called *proper* if $\lim_{\xi\to\infty} G(\xi)$ exists, and *strictly proper* if $\lim_{\xi\to\infty} G(\xi) = 0$. If $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{r\times n}(\xi)$ and $H \coloneqq Z^\star Z$, then Z is called a *spectral factor* of H if (i) Z is analytic in $\mathbb{C}_+$, and (ii) $Z(\lambda)$ has full row rank for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$. If $G \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}(\xi)$, then $\|G\|_\infty$ denotes its $\mathscr{H}_\infty$ norm, and it is called bounded-real if $\|G\|_\infty \le 1$ (i.e., G satisfies $I - G(\bar\lambda)^T G(\lambda) \ge 0$ for all $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$). If $m = n$, then G is called positive-real if (i) G is analytic in $\mathbb{C}_+$, and (ii) $G(\bar\lambda)^T + G(\lambda) \ge 0$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$.

This paper considers the state-space model

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{B}_s = \{(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{L}_2^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R}^n)\times\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R}^m)\times AC\left(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R}^d\right)\\ \text{such that } \tfrac{d\mathbf{x}}{dt} = A\mathbf{x}+B\mathbf{u} \text{ and } \mathbf{y} = C\mathbf{x}+D\mathbf{u}\},\\ A\in\mathbb{R}^{d\times d}, B\in\mathbb{R}^{d\times n}, C\in\mathbb{R}^{m\times d}, D\in\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}. \quad (1)\end{aligned}$$

Here and throughout the paper, $\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{loc}}\left(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R}^k\right)$ and $AC\left(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R}^k\right)$ denote the (k-vector-valued) locally square integrable functions and absolutely continuous functions, and differentiation is interpreted in a weak sense (see [6, Section 2.3.2]). In particular, for any given $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{L}_2^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, there exists a unique $(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_s$ with $\mathbf{x}(t_0) = \mathbf{x}_0$, which is given by the variation of the constants formula:

$$\mathbf{x}(t) = e^{A(t-t_0)}\mathbf{x}_0 + \textstyle\int_{t_0}^t e^{A(t-\tau)}B\mathbf{u}(\tau)d\tau, \text{ and} \quad (2)$$

$$\mathbf{y}(t) = Ce^{A(t-t_0)}\mathbf{x}_0 + D\mathbf{u}(t) + \textstyle\int_{t_0}^t Ce^{A(t-\tau)}B\mathbf{u}(\tau)d\tau, \quad (3)$$

for all $t \ge t_0$. Finally, the external behavior of (1) is denoted

$$\mathcal{B}_s^{(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y})} \coloneqq \{(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y}) \mid \exists \mathbf{x} \text{ such that } (\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_s\}.$$

III. Non-expansive systems

The bounded-real lemma considers the state-space model in (1), and the optimal control problem

$$\begin{aligned}S_a^{\sigma_g}(\mathbf{x}_0) \coloneqq \sup_{t_1\ge t_0, \mathbf{u}\in\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R}^n)} \textstyle\int_{t_0}^{t_1} (\mathbf{y}^T\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{u}^T\mathbf{u})(t)dt\\ \text{where } (\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_s, \mathbf{x}(t_0) = \mathbf{x}_0. \quad (4)\end{aligned}$$

From the variation of the constants formula, $S_a^{\sigma_g}(\mathbf{x}_0)$ is uniquely determined for any given $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, with $S_a^{\sigma_g}(\mathbf{x}_0) = \infty$ when the set $\{\int_{t_0}^{t_1} (\mathbf{y}^T\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{u}^T\mathbf{u})(t)dt \mid t_1 \ge t_0, (\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_s, \text{ and } \mathbf{x}(t_0) = \mathbf{x}_0\}$ is not bounded above. If $S_a^{\sigma_g}(\mathbf{x}_0) < \infty$ for all $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then the system is called *non-expansive*.

The bounded-real lemma provides the solution (if it exists) to the optimal control problem (4), and several necessary and sufficient conditions under which the system is non-expansive. These relate: (a) the alternative optimal control problem

$$\begin{aligned}S_r^{\sigma_g}(\mathbf{x}_0) \coloneqq \inf_{t_1\le t_0, \mathbf{u}\in\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R}^n)} \textstyle\int_{t_1}^{t_0} (\mathbf{u}^T\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{y}^T\mathbf{y})(t)dt\\ \text{where } (\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_s, \mathbf{x}(t_1) = 0, \mathbf{x}(t_0) = \mathbf{x}_0; \quad (5)\end{aligned}$$

(b) the existence of matrices $X \in \mathbb{R}_s^{d\times d}$ such that $X \ge 0$ and

$$\Lambda(X) \coloneqq \begin{bmatrix} -A^TX - XA - C^TC & -C^TD - XB \\ -D^TC - B^TX & I - D^TD \end{bmatrix} \quad (6)$$

satisfies $\Lambda(X) \ge 0$; and (c) whether the transfer function

$$G(\xi) \coloneqq D + C(\xi I - A)^{-1}B \quad (7)$$

is *bounded-real*. Also, if $I - D^TD > 0$ then, with the notation

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi(X) \coloneqq -A^TX - XA - C^TC\\ -(C^TD + XB)(I - D^TD)^{-1}(D^TC + B^TX), \quad (8)\\ \text{and } A_\Pi(X) \coloneqq A + B(I - D^TD)^{-1}(D^TC + B^TX), \quad (9)\end{aligned}$$

the conditions (a)–(c) also relate to the properties of the ARE $\Pi(X) = 0$. Critically to this paper, it is typically assumed that (i) (A,B) is controllable, and (ii) (C,A) is observable. With

$$V_c \coloneqq \begin{bmatrix} B & AB & \cdots & A^{d-1}B \end{bmatrix}, \text{ and} \quad (10)$$

$$V_o \coloneqq \operatorname{col}\begin{pmatrix} C & CA & \cdots & CA^{d-1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (11)$$

then these assumptions amount to the algebraic constraints (i) $\operatorname{rank}(V_c) = d$, and (ii) $\operatorname{rank}(V_o) = d$, respectively.

Lemma 1 (Bounded-real lemma): Let $\mathcal{B}_s$ be as in (1) with (A,B) controllable and (C,A) observable; and let $S_a^{\sigma_g}, S_r^{\sigma_g}, \Lambda, G$ be as in (4)–(7). The following are equivalent:

1. $S_a^{\sigma_g}(\mathbf{x}_0) < \infty$ for all $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$.
2. $S_r^{\sigma_g}(\mathbf{x}_0) < \infty$ for all $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$.
3. G is bounded-real (i.e., $\|G\|_\infty \le 1$).
4. There exists $X \in \mathbb{R}_s^{d\times d}$ such that $X \ge 0$ and $\Lambda(X) \ge 0$.
5. $S_a^{\sigma_g}(\mathbf{x}_0) = \mathbf{x}_0^TX_-\mathbf{x}_0$ and $S_r^{\sigma_g}(\mathbf{x}_0) = \mathbf{x}_0^TX_+\mathbf{x}_0$, where $X_-, X_+ \in \mathbb{R}_s^{d\times d}$ satisfy (i) $\Lambda(X_-) \ge 0$ and $\Lambda(X_+) \ge 0$; and (ii) if $X \in \mathbb{R}_s^{d\times d}$ satisfies $\Lambda(X) \ge 0$, then $0 < X_- \le X \le X_+$.

If, in addition, $I - D^TD > 0$, then, with $\Pi(X), A_\Pi(X)$ as in (8)–(9), conditions 1–5 are equivalent to each of the following:

6. There exists a unique $X_- \in \mathbb{R}_s^{d\times d}$ satisfying (i) $X_- \ge 0$; (ii) $\Pi(X_-) = 0$; and (iii) $\operatorname{spec}(A_\Pi(X_-)) \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$.
7. There exists a unique $X_+ \in \mathbb{R}_s^{d\times d}$ satisfying (i) $X_+ \ge 0$; (ii) $\Pi(X_+) = 0$; and (iii) $\operatorname{spec}(A_\Pi(X_+)) \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$.

Moreover, if conditions 6 and 7 hold, then $S_a^{\sigma_g}(\mathbf{x}_0) = \mathbf{x}_0^TX_-\mathbf{x}_0$ and $S_r^{\sigma_g}(\mathbf{x}_0) = \mathbf{x}_0^TX_+\mathbf{x}_0$.

Proof: See [3, Theorems 3–6] ∎

However, the conditions in Theorem 1 are no longer equivalent if the controllability and observability assumptions are removed, as the following examples illustrate.

1) If $(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_s$, $\mathbf{x}(t_1) = 0$, and $\mathbf{x}(t_0) = \mathbf{x}_0$, then $\mathbf{x}_0$ must be in the range of V_c. When (A,B) is not controllable, there exist $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ which are not in the range of V_c. For such $\mathbf{x}_0$, $S_r^{\sigma_g}(\mathbf{x}_0)$ is not well defined.
2) Conditions 1 and 3 in Theorem 1 are not equivalent when (A,B) is not controllable. For example, consider $\mathcal{B}_s$ in (1) with $A{=}-1$, $B{=}0$, $C{=}1$, and $D{=}1$. Then $D{+}C(\xi I{-}A)^{-1}B = 1$, which is bounded-real. But if $u(t) = e^{2t}$ for all $t \ge 0$, and $x(0) = 1$, then $x(t) = e^{-t}$ and $y(t) = e^{2t} + e^{-t}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\int_0^{t_1} y(t)^2{-}u(t)^2dt = 2e^{t_1} - \frac{1}{2}e^{-2t_1} - \frac{3}{2}$, so $S_a^{\sigma_g}(1) = \infty$.
3) The ordering of solutions to the LMI $\Lambda(X) \ge 0$ in condition 5 does not hold when (A,B) is not controllable and/or (C,A) is not observable. For example, if $\mathcal{B}_s$ is as in (1) with $A{=}0$, $B{=}0$, $C{=}0$, and $D{=}1$, then $\Lambda(X) = 0$ for all $X \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus, there is no lower or upper bound on the set of $X \in \mathbb{R}_s^{d\times d}$ satisfying $\Lambda(X) \ge 0$.

In contrast to Theorem 1, the *strictly bounded real lemma* makes no controllability or observability assumptions. The

following version of this lemma is from [7], and is a slight strengthening of the textbook version.

Lemma 2 (Strictly bounded-real lemma): Let $\mathcal{B}_s, G, \Pi$ and A_Π be as in (1)–(9). The following are equivalent:

1. $\text{spec}(A) \in \mathbb{C}_-$ and $I - G(\bar{\lambda})^T G(\lambda) > 0$ for all $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_+ \cup \infty$.
2. $I - D^T D > 0$ and there exists $X \in \mathbb{R}_s^{d\times d}$ such that $X \geq 0$, $\Pi(X) = 0$, and $\text{spec}(A_\Pi(X)) \in \mathbb{C}_-$.

It is easily shown from Lemma 2 that if $\text{spec}(A) \in \mathbb{C}_-$ and $\|G\|_\infty < 1$, then $S_a^{\sigma_g}(\mathbf{x}_0) < \infty$ for all $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$. This observation is crucial for the proof in [8] of the $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ sub-optimal control problem. In contrast, the condition $\|G\|_\infty \leq 1$ does not guarantee that $S_a^{\sigma_g}(\mathbf{x}_0) < \infty$ for all $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ (see Example 2 after Lemma 1).

One of our main objectives is to provide equivalent conditions to condition 1 in Theorem 1 which hold irrespective of controllability or observability. The conditions are inspired by [4], which provided a version of the positive-real lemma with no controllability or observability assumptions. In contrast to [4], the focus in this paper is on the optimal control problems (4) and (13), and we obtain an explicit description of the solutions to these two problems (irrespective of controllability).

An important new concept, which will replace the bounded-real condition in Theorem 1, is the following.

Definition 3 (Bounded-real pair): Let $P \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}[\xi]$ and $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m}[\xi]$. We call (P, Q) a *bounded-real pair* if the following hold:

(a) $Q(\lambda)Q(\bar{\lambda})^T - P(\lambda)P(\bar{\lambda})^T \geq 0$ for all $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$.
(b) $\text{rank}\left(\begin{bmatrix} P & -Q \end{bmatrix}(\lambda)\right) = m$ for all $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$.
(c) If $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^m[\xi]$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ satisfy $\mathbf{p}^T(QQ^\star - PP^\star) = 0$ and $\mathbf{p}(\lambda)^T \begin{bmatrix} P & -Q \end{bmatrix}(\lambda) = 0$, then $\mathbf{p}(\lambda) = 0$.

It can be verified that if (P, Q) is a bounded-real pair, then Q is nonsingular and $\|Q^{-1}P\|_\infty \leq 1$. However, the converse is not true. For example, if $P(\xi) = Q(\xi) = \xi + 1$, then $\|Q^{-1}P\|_\infty = 1$, and condition (b) in Definition 9 holds, but condition (c) does not, so (P, Q) is not a bounded-real pair.

The main results in this section are in Theorems 6–8, which will be proved in Sections VIII and IX. Prior to stating these theorems, we note the following lemma (see [9, Section 2]).

Lemma 4: Let $\mathcal{B}_s$ be as in (1) and $\mathcal{A}(\xi) := \xi I - A$. There exist polynomial matrices $P, Q, M, N, U, V, Z_1, Z_2, Z_3$ such that

1. $\begin{bmatrix} M & N \\ U & V \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} -D & I & -C \\ -B & 0 & \mathcal{A} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -P & Q & 0 \\ -Z_1 & -Z_2 & Z_3 \end{bmatrix}$;
2. $\begin{bmatrix} M & N \\ U & V \end{bmatrix}$ is unimodular; and
3. Z_3 is nonsingular.

Furthermore, whenever conditions 1–3 are satisfied, then the external behavior of $\mathcal{B}_s$ satisfies

$$\mathcal{B}_s^{(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y})} = \{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathcal{L}_2^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{L}_2^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^m) \mid P(\tfrac{d}{dt})\mathbf{u} = Q(\tfrac{d}{dt})\mathbf{y}\}. \quad (12)$$

Also, if $\mathcal{B}_s^{(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y})}$ is as in (12), then there exist polynomial matrices M, N, U, V, Z_1, Z_2 and Z_3 satisfying conditions 1–3.

Remark 5: Note that if $\mathcal{B}_s$ in (1) satisfies (12), then $G(\xi) := D + C(\xi I - A)^{-1}B$ satisfies $Q^{-1}P = G$. However, the condition $Q^{-1}P = G$ is only sufficient to guarantee that the external behavior satisfies (12) if P and Q are left coprime. If this is not the case, then $\mathcal{B}_s^{(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y})}$ is *behaviorally uncontrollable* (see [6, Section 5.2]); (A, B) must be uncontrollable; and (12) imposes additional conditions on the uncontrollable modes of $\mathcal{B}_s$ corresponding to conditions 1–3 in Lemma 4.

We now state the main results in this section.

Theorem 6: Let $\mathcal{B}_s, V_o, S_a^{\sigma_g}$, and Λ be as in (1)–(6). The following are equivalent:

1. $S_a^{\sigma_g}(\mathbf{x}_0) < \infty$ for all $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$.
2. The external behavior $\mathcal{B}_s^{(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y})}$ takes the form of (12), where (P, Q) is a bounded-real pair.
3. There exists $X \in \mathbb{R}_s^{d\times d}$ such that $X \geq 0$ and $\Lambda(X) \geq 0$.
4. $S_a^{\sigma_g}(\mathbf{x}_0) = \mathbf{x}_0^T X_- \mathbf{x}_0$, where $X_- \in \mathbb{R}_s^{d\times d}$ satisfies (i) $X_- \geq 0$; (ii) $\Lambda(X_-) \geq 0$; (iii) if $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then $V_o\mathbf{z} = 0 \iff X_-\mathbf{z} = 0$; and (iv) if $X \in \mathbb{R}_s^{d\times d}$ satisfies $X \geq 0$ and $\Lambda(X) \geq 0$, then $X_- \leq X$.

Moreover, if (C, A) is observable and the above conditions hold, then (i) $\text{spec}(A) \in \mathbb{C}_-$; and (ii) if $X \in \mathbb{R}_s^{d\times d}$ satisfies $\Lambda(X) \geq 0$, then $X_- \leq X$.

Theorem 7 provides an explicit description of the solution to the optimal control problem (4) in the case $I - D^T D > 0$.

Theorem 7: Let $\mathcal{B}_s, V_o, S_a^{\sigma_g}, G, \Pi$, and A_Π be as in (1)–(9), and let $I - D^T D > 0$. The following are equivalent

1. $S_a^{\sigma_g}(\mathbf{x}_0) < \infty$ for all $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$.
2. There exists $X_- \in \mathbb{R}_s^{d\times d}$ satisfying (i) $X_- \geq 0$; (ii) $\Pi(X_-) = 0$; (iii) if $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfies $V_o\mathbf{z} = 0$, then $X_-\mathbf{z} = 0$; and (iv) if $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$ and $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^d$ satisfy $A_\Pi(X_-)\mathbf{z} = \lambda\mathbf{z}$, then $V_o\mathbf{z} = 0$.

Moreover, if these conditions hold, then $S_a^{\sigma_g}(\mathbf{x}_0) = \mathbf{x}_0^T X_- \mathbf{x}_0$.

Theorem 8 solves (4) in the general case.

Theorem 8: Let $\mathcal{B}_s, V_o, S_a^{\sigma_g}$, and G be as in (1)–(7). The following are equivalent:

1. $S_a^{\sigma_g}(\mathbf{x}_0) < \infty$ for all $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$.
2. There exists $X_- \in \mathbb{R}_s^{d\times d}$ satisfying (i) $X_- \geq 0$; (ii) if $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfies $V_o\mathbf{z} = 0$, then $X_-\mathbf{z} = 0$; and (iii) there exist real matrices L and W such that

(iiia) $-A^T X_- - X_- A - C^T C = L^T L$, $-D^T C - B^T X_- = W^T L$, and $I - D^T D = W^T W$; and
(iiib) $Z(\xi) := W + L(\xi I - A)^{-1}B$ is a spectral factor of $I - G^\star G$.

Moreover, if these conditions hold, then $S_a^{\sigma_g}(\mathbf{x}_0) = \mathbf{x}_0^T X_- \mathbf{x}_0$.

IV. Passive systems

The paper [4] presented a theory of passive systems which makes no controllability assumptions. A key new concept in [4] is the following.

Definition 9 (Positive-real pair): Let $P, Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}[\xi]$. We call (P, Q) a *positive-real pair* if the following hold:

(a) $P(\lambda)Q(\bar{\lambda})^T + Q(\lambda)P(\bar{\lambda})^T \geq 0$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$.
(b) $\text{rank}\left(\begin{bmatrix} P & -Q \end{bmatrix}(\lambda)\right) = n$ for all $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$.
(c) If $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^n[\xi]$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ satisfy $\mathbf{p}^T(PQ^\star + QP^\star) = 0$ and $\mathbf{p}(\lambda)^T \begin{bmatrix} P & -Q \end{bmatrix}(\lambda) = 0$, then $\mathbf{p}(\lambda) = 0$.

In this paper, we develop the results in [4] by considering a related optimal control problem for the system $\mathcal{B}_s$ in (1) when $m = n$ (i.e., there are equal numbers of inputs and outputs). It was shown in [4, Theorem 7] that any passive linear system can be represented in this form for some partitioning $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y})$

of the system's variables such that $\sigma_p(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y}) \coloneqq \mathbf{u}^T\mathbf{y}$ is the power supplied to the system. In this paper, we will solve the optimal control problem (without assuming controllability):

$$S_a^{\sigma_p}(\mathbf{x}_0) \coloneqq \sup_{t_1 \geq t_0, \mathbf{u}\in\mathcal{L}_2^{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R}^n)} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} -(\mathbf{u}^T\mathbf{y})(t)dt \quad \text{where } (\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_s, \mathbf{x}(t_0)=\mathbf{x}_0, \quad (13)$$

which gives the least upper bound on the energy which can be extracted from the system from t_0 onwards. Accordingly, we call $S_a^{\sigma_p}$ the *available energy*. We provide necessary and sufficient conditions for $S_a^{\sigma_p}(\mathbf{x}_0) < \infty$ for all $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$. These relate: (a) the existence of real matrices $X \geq 0$ such that

$$\Omega(X) \coloneqq \begin{bmatrix} -A^TX - XA & C^T - XB \\ C - B^TX & D + D^T \end{bmatrix} \quad (14)$$

satisfies the LMI $\Omega(X) \geq 0$; and (b) the concept of a positive-real pair of polynomial matrices. We also characterize the set $\{X \in \mathbb{R}_s^{d\times d} \mid X \geq 0 \text{ and } \Omega(X) \geq 0\}$. Furthermore, if $D + D^T > 0$ then, with the notation

$$\Gamma(X) \coloneqq -A^TX - XA - (C^T - XB)(D + D^T)^{-1}(C - B^TX), \quad (15)$$

$$\text{and } A_\Gamma(X) \coloneqq A - B(D + D^T)^{-1}(C - B^TX), \quad (16)$$

we provide an equivalent condition concerning the ARE $\Gamma(X) = 0$. The main results in this section are in the next three theorems, which will be proved in Sections VI and VII.

Theorem 10: Let $\mathcal{B}_s$ be as in (1) with $m = n$; let $S_a^{\sigma_p}$ and Ω be as in (13)–(14); and let V_o be as in (11). The following are equivalent:

1. $S_a^{\sigma_p}(\mathbf{x}_0) < \infty$ for all $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$.
2. The external behavior $\mathcal{B}_s^{(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y})}$ takes the form of (12), where (P, Q) is a positive-real pair.
3. There exists $X \in \mathbb{R}_s^{d\times d}$ such that $X \geq 0$ and $\Omega(X) \geq 0$.
4. $S_a^{\sigma_p}(\mathbf{x}_0) = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}_0^TX_-\mathbf{x}_0$, where $X_- \in \mathbb{R}_s^{d\times d}$ satisfies (i) $X_- \geq 0$; (ii) $\Omega(X_-) \geq 0$; (iii) if $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then $V_o\mathbf{z} = 0 \iff X_-\mathbf{z} = 0$; and (iv) if $X \in \mathbb{R}_s^{d\times d}$ satisfies $X \geq 0$ and $\Omega(X) \geq 0$, then $X_- \leq X$.

Moreover, if (C, A) is observable and the above conditions hold, then (i) $\text{spec}(A) \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$; and (ii) if $X \in \mathbb{R}_s^{d\times d}$ satisfies $\Omega(X) \geq 0$, then $X_- \leq X$.

Remark 11: Condition 2 in the above theorem augments the positive-real condition with additional conditions on the uncontrollable modes of a system which are both necessary and sufficient for the boundedness of the optimal control problem in (13). Note initially that Q is necessarily invertible, and $G \coloneqq Q^{-1}P$ satisfies $G(\xi) = D + C(\xi I - A)^{-1}B$. Then, from [4, Sections 4–5], condition (a) of Definition 9 is equivalent to G being positive-real. Also, condition (b) of Definition 9 is equivalent to the behavioral stabilizability of $\mathcal{B}_s^{(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y})}$. In particular, if (C, A) is observable, then this implies that (A, B) is stabilizable, i.e., $\begin{bmatrix}\lambda I - A & B\end{bmatrix}$ has full row rank for all $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$. Finally, condition (c) of Definition 9 is a coupling condition between the so-called *lossless* and *autonomous* trajectories of the system.

The next theorem provides an explicit expression for $S_a^{\sigma_p}$ for the case with $D + D^T > 0$.

Theorem 12: Let $\mathcal{B}_s$ be as in (1) with $m = n$; let $S_a^{\sigma_p}, \Gamma$, and A_Γ be as in (13)–(16); let V_o be as in (11); and let $D+D^T>0$. The following are equivalent:

1. $S_a^{\sigma_p}(\mathbf{x}_0) < \infty$ for all $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$.
2. There exists $X_- \in \mathbb{R}_s^{d\times d}$ satisfying (i) $X_- \geq 0$; (ii) $\Gamma(X_-) = 0$; (iii) if $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfies $V_o\mathbf{z} = 0$, then $X_-\mathbf{z} = 0$; and (iv) if $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$ and $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^d$ satisfy $A_\Gamma(X_-)\mathbf{z} = \lambda\mathbf{z}$, then $V_o\mathbf{z} = 0$.

Moreover, if these conditions hold, then $S_a^{\sigma_p}(\mathbf{x}_0)=\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}_0^TX_-\mathbf{x}_0$.

The final theorem provides an explicit expression for $S_a^{\sigma_p}$ in the general case.

Theorem 13: Let $\mathcal{B}_s$ be as in (1) with $m = n$; let $S_a^{\sigma_p}$ be as in (13); and let G and V_o be as in (7) and (11). The following are equivalent:

1. $S_a^{\sigma_p}(\mathbf{x}_0) < \infty$ for all $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$.
2. There exists $X_- \in \mathbb{R}_s^{d\times d}$ satisfying (i) $X_- \geq 0$; (ii) if $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfies $V_o\mathbf{z} = 0$, then $X_-\mathbf{z} = 0$; and (iii) there exist real matrices L and W such that

(iiia) $-A^TX_- - X_-A = L^TL$, $C - B^TX_- = W^TL$, and $D + D^T = W^TW$,

(iiib) $Z(\xi)\coloneqq W+L(\xi I-A)^{-1}B$ is a spectral factor of $G+G^\star$.

Moreover, if these conditions hold, then $S_a^{\sigma_p}(\mathbf{x}_0)=\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}_0^TX_-\mathbf{x}_0$.

In proving Theorems 10–13, we will indicate how to compute $S_a^{\sigma_p}$, and how to obtain a linear state feedback law such that, with $\mathbf{x}_0 \coloneqq \mathbf{x}(t_0)$, then $-\int_{t_0}^{\infty}(\mathbf{u}^T\mathbf{y})(t)dt$ is arbitrarily close to $S_a^{\sigma_p}(\mathbf{x}_0)$ (see Remark 25).

In the next section, we prove several results relevant to both optimal control problems (4) and (13). The following two sections contain the proofs of Theorems 10–13. The final section contains the proofs of the theorems in Section III. First, we conclude this section with an example to illustrate the distinction between the results in this section and other papers in the literature which deal with similar objectives.

It has long been recognised that the controllability and observability assumptions in the positive-real lemma are unduly restrictive, and there have been many notable attempts to relax these assumptions. A comprehensive summary is provided in [5, Section 3.3] (see also [10] for additional properties of the LMI $\Omega(X) \geq 0$). These results focus on the equivalence of the positive-real condition with the existence of solutions $X \in \mathbb{R}_s^{d\times d}$ to an LMI (similar to condition 3 of Theorem 10) or an ARE (similar to condition 2 of Theorem 12) [11]–[14]. None of these papers explicitly consider the optimal control problem (13). Also, each of these papers introduce alternative assumptions which are not necessary for guaranteeing a solution to the optimal control problem. These assumptions include: (i) $\text{spec}(A) \in \mathbb{C}_-$ [13], [14]; (ii) (A, B) is stabilizable [11], [12]; (iii) $G + G^\star$ is nonsingular [12]; (iv) $G(j\omega)+G(-j\omega)^T > 0$ for all $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ [11], [14] (note that this implies (iii)); and (v) (C, A) is observable [11], [12]. A key objective of this paper is to avoid such assumptions entirely.

We also note that several papers have sought to demonstrate the equivalence of the conditions (a) $G(j\omega) + G(-j\omega)^T \geq 0$ for all $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$; and (b) there exists $X \in \mathbb{R}_s^{d\times d}$ (not necessarily non-negative definite) such that $\Omega(X) \geq 0$ [15], [16]. The papers [17], [18] consider a similar problem using the formalism of the behavioral approach. These papers again introduce

additional assumptions. Specifically, [15] assumes that A is *unmixed*; and [16] assumes *sign controllability*. Both of these conditions imply the assumption (vi) $\begin{bmatrix} j\omega I - A & B \end{bmatrix}$ has full row rank for all $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$. Also, [18] assumes conditions (iii), (v) and (vi); and [17] considers only single-input single-output systems which satisfy conditions (v) and (vi).

However, there are physical systems which do not satisfy any of the assumptions introduced in these papers. For example, consider the two electric circuits in Fig. 1. Note that neither of these circuits are stabilizable (and both circuits violate assumptions (i), (ii) and (vi) in the previous discussion). Also, the circuit on the right has $G+G^\star = 0$ (and also violates assumptions (iii) and (iv)). Now, consider the circuit on the left. Following Lemma 17, we let

$$T \coloneqq \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \text{ so } T^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

which transform the system into observer staircase form:

$$\hat{A} \coloneqq TAT^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 & -1 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \hat{B} \coloneqq TB = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix},$$
$$\text{and } \hat{C} \coloneqq CT^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We note that the final three columns of $V_o T^{-1}$ are zero (so this circuit also violates assumption (v)), and it follows from Theorem 10 that $X_- = T^T \hat{X}_- T$ where $\hat{X}_- = \operatorname{diag}\begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and λ is the least positive real number satisfying

$$\begin{bmatrix} -\hat{A}^T\hat{X}_- - \hat{X}_-\hat{A} & \hat{C}^T - \hat{X}_-\hat{B} \\ \hat{C} - \hat{B}^T\hat{X}_- & D + D^T \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 2\lambda & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0_{3\times 3} & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix} \geq 0.$$

Thus, $\lambda = \frac{1}{4}$, and from Theorem 10 we conclude that, with $\mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{x}(0)$, then $S_a^{\sigma_p}(\mathbf{x}_0) = \frac{1}{8}((i_1 + i_2 - v_3 - v_4)(0))^2$. Note that more energy can be extracted from this system than can be extracted from the system $\mathcal{B} = \{(u, y) \in \mathcal{L}_2^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) \times \mathcal{L}_2^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) \mid y = u\}$ (for which $-\int_{t_0}^{t_1} (u^T y)(t)dt \leq 0$), despite the fact that both systems have the same transfer function.

In Remark 25, we will show how to extract the maximum possible amount of energy from this circuit. Following that remark, we let $i = -(D + D^T)^{-1}(C - B^T X_-)\mathbf{x} = \frac{1}{2}(i_1 + i_2 - v_3 - v_4)$. From the variation of the constants formula,

$$\begin{bmatrix} i_1 \\ i_2 \\ v_3 \\ v_4 \end{bmatrix}(t) = \frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix} (\cos(t)+e^{-t})(i_1-i_2)(0)+\sin(t)(v_3-v_4)(0) \\ (-\cos(t)+e^{-t})(i_1-i_2)(0)-\sin(t)(v_3-v_4)(0) \\ -\sin(t)(i_1-i_2)(0)+(\cos(t)+e^{-t})(v_3-v_4)(0) \\ \sin(t)(i_1-i_2)(0)+(-\cos(t)+e^{-t})(v_3-v_4)(0) \end{bmatrix},$$

whereupon $v(t) = -\frac{1}{2}e^{-t}((i_1 + i_2 - v_3 - v_4)(0)) = -i(t)$. It can then be verified that $-\int_0^\infty i(t)v(t)dt = \frac{1}{8}((i_1 + i_2 - v_3 - v_4)(0))^2 = S_a^{\sigma_p}(\mathbf{x}_0)$.

Now, consider the circuit on the right of Fig. 1. We let

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}, C = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, D = 0.$$

From Theorem 10, we find that if $\mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{x}(0)$, then $S_a^{\sigma_p}(\mathbf{x}_0) = \frac{1}{4}((i_1+i_2)(0)^2 + (v_3+v_4)(0)^2)$. Again, Remark 25 explains how to extract the maximum amount of energy from this circuit. In that remark,

$$A_\epsilon = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & -2\epsilon \end{bmatrix}, B_\epsilon = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 2\sqrt{1+\epsilon^2} \end{bmatrix}, C_\epsilon = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \frac{1-\epsilon^2}{\sqrt{1+\epsilon^2}} \end{bmatrix}, D_\epsilon = \epsilon,$$
$$X_-^\epsilon = \frac{(1-\epsilon)^2}{2(1+\epsilon^2)} I, u_\epsilon = -\frac{1-\epsilon}{\sqrt{1+\epsilon^2}}(v_3 + v_4), u = -(v_3+v_4) = -y.$$

We then let $i = u$ and $v = y$. In this case, i and v are independent of ϵ, and it can be verified that $i(t) = te^{-t}(i_1+i_2)(0) + (te^{-t} - e^{-t})(v_3 + v_4)(0) = -v(t)$ and $-\int_0^\infty (i(t)v(t)dt) = \frac{1}{4}((i_1+i_2)(0)^2 + (v_3+v_4)(0)^2)$.


$\frac{dv_4}{dt}=i_4$
$v_1=\frac{di_1}{dt}$
$v_5=i_5$
$\frac{dv_3}{dt}=i_3$
$v_2=\frac{di_2}{dt}$
$\frac{dv_4}{dt}=i_4$
$v_1=\frac{di_1}{dt}$
$\frac{dv_3}{dt}=i_3$
$v_2=\frac{di_2}{dt}$
$\frac{d\mathbf{x}}{dt} = A\mathbf{x} + Bi, v = C\mathbf{x} + Di,$
$\mathbf{x}$=col $(i_1 \quad i_2 \quad v_3 \quad v_4)$
$A=\begin{bmatrix} -1 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, B=\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$
$C=\begin{bmatrix} -1 & -1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, D=1$
$\begin{bmatrix} j & -j & 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} jI-A & B \end{bmatrix}=0$
$G(\xi):=D + C(\xi I - A)^{-1}B=1.$
$\frac{d\mathbf{x}}{dt} = \hat{A}\mathbf{x} + \hat{B}i, v = \hat{C}\mathbf{x} + \hat{D}i,$
$\mathbf{x} = \text{col}\,(i_1+i_2 \quad v_3+v_4 \quad i_1 \quad v_3)$
$\hat{A}=\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \hat{B}=\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$
$\hat{C}=\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \hat{D}=0$
$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & -j \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} jI-\hat{A} & \hat{B} \end{bmatrix}=0$
$G(\xi):=\hat{D} + \hat{C}(\xi I - \hat{A})^{-1}\hat{B}=\frac{2\xi}{\xi^2+1}.$

Fig. 1. Two electric circuits with uncontrollable and unobservable state-space representations.

V. Storage functions

In the proof of the positive-real and bounded-real lemmas, it is helpful to invoke the concept of *storage functions*. A special emphasis is often placed on two special state-dependent functions, which both turn out to be storage functions for *controllable* systems: the *available storage* and *required supply*. In this section, we provide a treatment of storage functions which is free of any controllability assumptions. The available storage continues to play a prominent role, but not the required supply, since this is not well defined for uncontrollable systems (as discussed in Section III).

We consider the quadratic form:

$$\sigma(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}) \coloneqq \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u}^T & \mathbf{y}^T \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_{11} & \Sigma_{12} \\ \Sigma_{12}^T & \Sigma_{22} \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix},$$
$$\Sigma_{11} \in \mathbb{R}_s^{n\times n}, \Sigma_{12} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}, \text{ and } \Sigma_{22} \in \mathbb{R}_s^{m\times m}; \qquad (17)$$

and the optimal control problem for the system $\mathcal{B}_s$ in (1):

$$S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0) = \sup_{t_1 \geq t_0, \mathbf{u}\in\mathcal{L}_2^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R}^n)} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} -(\sigma(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}))(t)dt$$
$$\text{where } (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_s \text{ and } \mathbf{x}(t_0) = \mathbf{x}_0. \qquad (18)$$

Here, S_a^σ is often referred to as the *available storage* [1]. Note, with $\Sigma_{11} = I$, $\Sigma_{12} = 0$ and $\Sigma_{22} = -I$ (resp., $\Sigma_{11} = \Sigma_{22} = 0$, $\Sigma_{12} = \frac{1}{2}I$), then $S_a^\sigma = S_a^{\sigma_g}$ (resp., $S_a^\sigma = S_a^{\sigma_p}$). As in [1], we define a storage function (with respect to σ) as follows.

Definition 14: Let $\mathcal{B}_s$ and σ be as in (1) and (17), respectively. We say S is a *storage function* with respect to the *supply rate* σ if (i) $S(\mathbf{x}_0) \in \mathbb{R}$ and $S(\mathbf{x}_0) \geq 0$ for all $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$; (ii) $S(0) = 0$; and (iii) if $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_s$ and $t_1 \geq t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, then $S(\mathbf{x}(t_1)) \leq \int_{t_0}^{t_1} (\sigma(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}))(t)dt + S(\mathbf{x}(t_0))$.

The following well known lemma proves that the boundedness of the available storage is equivalent to the existence of a storage function.

Lemma 15: Let $\mathcal{B}_s$, σ, and S_a^σ be as in (1), (17), and (18), respectively. The following hold:

1. If $S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0) < \infty$ for all $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then S_a^σ is a storage function with respect to σ.
2. If there exists a storage function with respect to σ (denoted S), then $S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0) \leq S(\mathbf{x}_0)$ for all $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$. In particular, $S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0) < \infty$ for all $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Proof: See [1, Theorem 1]. ∎

It is often assumed that the solution to an optimal control problem with a quadratic supply rate, if it exists, is a quadratic form in the initial state $\mathbf{x}_0$. This is relatively straightforward to establish when the optimization is over a fixed and finite time interval. However, the optimization problem in Lemma 15 is over a variable and potentially infinite time interval. As emphasised in [3], to establish if the solution to this optimization problem is a quadratic form requires a proof. No proof of this important result is provided in [1], and the proof in [3] assumes controllability. The following result provides a proof subject to a restriction which will turn out to be satisfied by both passive and non-expansive systems.

Lemma 16: Let $\mathcal{B}_s$, σ, and S_a^σ be as in (1), (17), and (18), respectively. Also, for any given $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, let there exist $t_1 \geq t_0$, and $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_s$ with $\mathbf{x}(t_0) = \mathbf{z}$, such that $-\int_{t_0}^{t_1} (\sigma(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}))(t)dt \geq 0$. If $S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0) < \infty$ for all $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then there exists $X \in \mathbb{R}_s^{d \times d}$ with $X \geq 0$ such that $S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0) = \mathbf{x}_0^T X \mathbf{x}_0$ for all $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Proof: It suffices to show (i) $S_a^\sigma(\lambda \mathbf{x}_0) = \lambda^2 S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0)$ for any given $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$; and (ii) $S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_1 + \mathbf{x}_2) + S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2) = 2(S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_1) + S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_2))$ for any given $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ [19, Section 2.3]. The proof is based on [19, Section 2.3] (which shows an analogous result for a finite time interval). The main difference in the proof which follows is that there may not exist a $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{L}_2^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ which achieves the supremum.

We first show that, for any given $t_1 \geq t_0$,

$$S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0) = \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{L}_2^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n), t_2 \geq t_1} -\int_{t_0}^{t_2} (\sigma(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}))(t)dt, \quad \text{such that } (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_s, \mathbf{x}(t_0) = \mathbf{x}_0. \quad (19)$$

To see this, let $t_1 \geq t_0$ and $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_s$ with $\mathbf{x}(t_0) = \mathbf{x}_0$ satisfy $-\int_{t_0}^{t_1} (\sigma(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}))(t)dt = S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0) - \epsilon$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. Then, from the conditions in the lemma statement, there exist $t_2 \geq t_1$ and $(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \in \mathcal{B}_s$ such that $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}(t) = \mathbf{u}(t)$, $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}(t) = \mathbf{y}(t)$, and $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(t) = \mathbf{x}(t)$ for all $t_0 \leq t \leq t_1$; and $-\int_{t_1}^{t_2} (\sigma(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}))(t)dt \geq 0$. It follows that $-\int_{t_0}^{t} (\sigma(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}))(t)dt \geq S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0) - \epsilon$ for all $t \geq t_1$. But $S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0) \geq -\int_{t_0}^{t} (\sigma(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}))(t)dt$, and $\epsilon > 0$ can be made arbitrarily small by choosing t_1 and $\mathbf{u}$. This proves (19).

To see (i), suppose instead that there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$S_a^\sigma(\lambda \mathbf{x}_0) = \lambda^2 (S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0) - \epsilon).$$

Let $t_1 \geq t_0$ and $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_s$ with $\mathbf{x}(t_0) = \mathbf{x}_0$ be such that $S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0) < \int_{t_0}^{t_1} -(\sigma(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}))(t)dt + \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Then, $(\lambda \mathbf{u}, \lambda \mathbf{y}, \lambda \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_s$, $\lambda \mathbf{x}(t_0) = \lambda \mathbf{x}_0$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^2 S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0) &< \lambda^2 (\textstyle\int_{t_0}^{t_1} -(\sigma(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}))(t)dt + \frac{\epsilon}{2}) \\ &= \textstyle\int_{t_0}^{t_1} -(\sigma(\lambda \mathbf{u}, \lambda \mathbf{y}))(t)dt + \frac{\lambda^2 \epsilon}{2} \\ &\leq S_a^\sigma(\lambda \mathbf{x}_0) + \frac{\lambda^2 \epsilon}{2} = \lambda^2 (S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0) - \tfrac{\epsilon}{2}), \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. Hence, $S_a^\sigma(\lambda \mathbf{x}_0) \geq \lambda^2 S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0)$. A similar argument gives $S_a^\sigma(\lambda \mathbf{x}_0) \leq \lambda^2 S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0)$, which proves (i).

To see (ii), suppose instead that there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_1 + \mathbf{x}_2) + S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2) + \epsilon = 2(S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_1) + S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_2)).$$

Let $t_1 \geq t_0$ and $(\mathbf{u}_a, \mathbf{y}_a, \mathbf{x}_a), (\mathbf{u}_b, \mathbf{y}_b, \mathbf{x}_b) \in \mathcal{B}_s$ with $\mathbf{x}_a(t_0) = \mathbf{x}_1$ and $\mathbf{x}_b(t_0) = \mathbf{x}_2$ be such that

$$\textstyle\int_{t_0}^{t_1} -(\sigma(\mathbf{u}_a, \mathbf{y}_a))(t)dt + \frac{\epsilon}{8} > S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_1), \text{ and}$$
$$\textstyle\int_{t_0}^{t_1} -(\sigma(\mathbf{u}_b, \mathbf{y}_b))(t)dt + \frac{\epsilon}{8} > S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_2).$$

Now, let $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_a := \mathbf{u}_a + \mathbf{u}_b$, $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_b := \mathbf{u}_a - \mathbf{u}_b$, $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_a := \mathbf{y}_a + \mathbf{y}_b$, $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_b := \mathbf{y}_a - \mathbf{y}_b$, $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_a := \mathbf{x}_a + \mathbf{x}_b$, and $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_b := \mathbf{x}_a - \mathbf{x}_b$. Then $(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_a, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_a, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_a), (\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_b, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_b, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_b) \in \mathcal{B}_s$, $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_a(t_0) = \mathbf{x}_1 + \mathbf{x}_2$, and $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_b(t_0) = \mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2$, whence

$$\begin{aligned} &S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_1 + \mathbf{x}_2) + S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2) \\ &\geq \textstyle\int_{t_0}^{t_1} -(\sigma(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_a, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_a))(t)dt + \int_{t_0}^{t_1} -(\sigma(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_b, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_b))(t)dt \\ &= 2(\textstyle\int_{t_0}^{t_1} -(\sigma(\mathbf{u}_a, \mathbf{y}_a))(t)dt + \int_{t_0}^{t_1} -(\sigma(\mathbf{u}_b, \mathbf{y}_b))(t)dt) \\ &\geq 2(S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_1) + S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_2) - \tfrac{\epsilon}{4}) = S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_1 + \mathbf{x}_2) + S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2) + \tfrac{\epsilon}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. Thus, $S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_1 + \mathbf{x}_2) + S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2) \leq 2(S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_1) + S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_2))$. A similar argument shows that $S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_1 + \mathbf{x}_2) + S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2) \geq 2(S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_1) + S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_2))$, and completes the proof. ∎

We next consider a related optimal control problem relating to the *observer staircase form*:

Lemma 17: Let $\mathcal{B}_s$ be as in (1); let the columns of $S_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times (d - \hat{d})}$ be a basis for the nullspace of V_o; let $S = \begin{bmatrix} S_1 & S_2 \end{bmatrix}$ be nonsingular; and let $S^{-1} =: T = \text{col}\begin{pmatrix} T_1 & T_2 \end{pmatrix}$ (partitioned compatibly with S). Then

$$\begin{bmatrix} T_1 \\ T_2 \end{bmatrix} A \begin{bmatrix} S_1 & S_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & 0 \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \; C \begin{bmatrix} S_1 & S_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} C_1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Furthermore, with the notation $B_1 := T_1 B$, $B_2 := T_2 B$, and

$$\hat{\mathcal{B}}_s = \{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) \in \mathcal{L}_2^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{L}_2^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \times AC(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^{\hat{d}}) \text{ such that } \tfrac{d\hat{\mathbf{x}}}{dt} = A_{11}\hat{\mathbf{x}} + B_1 \mathbf{u} \text{ and } \mathbf{y} = C_1 \hat{\mathbf{x}} + D\mathbf{u}\},$$

then $\mathcal{B}_s^{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y})} = \hat{\mathcal{B}}_s^{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y})}$, and (C_1, A_{11}) is observable.

Proof: The transformation of A and C is well known (see e.g., [6, Corollary 5.3.14]). The rest of the proof is easily shown from the variation of the constants formula. ∎

Lemma 18: Let $\mathcal{B}_s$, σ, and S_a^σ be as in (1), (17), and (18), respectively; let $S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0) < \infty$ for all $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$; let T_1 and $\hat{\mathcal{B}}_s$ be as in Lemma 17; and let

$$\hat{S}_a^\sigma(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_0) := \sup_{t_1 \geq t_0, \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{L}_2^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n)} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} -(\sigma(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}))(t)dt, \quad \text{such that } (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) \in \hat{\mathcal{B}}_s, \hat{\mathbf{x}}(t_0) = \hat{\mathbf{x}}_0. \quad (20)$$

Then $S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0) = \hat{S}_a^\sigma(T_1\mathbf{x}_0)$ for all $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$. In particular, with V_o as in (11), then $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $V_o\mathbf{z} = 0$ imply $S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{z}) = 0$.

Proof: Let $T = \operatorname{col}\begin{pmatrix} T_1 & T_2 \end{pmatrix}$ be as in Lemma 17. It can be shown from the variation of the constants formula that (i) if $(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_s$ satisfies $\mathbf{x}(t_0) = \mathbf{x}_0$, then there exists $(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y},\hat{\mathbf{x}}) \in \hat{\mathcal{B}}_s$ with $\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t_0) = T_1\mathbf{x}_0$; and (ii) if $(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y},\hat{\mathbf{x}}) \in \hat{\mathcal{B}}_s$ satisfies $\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t_0) = \hat{\mathbf{x}}_0$, and $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d-\hat{d}}$, then there exists $(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_s$ with $\mathbf{x}(t_0) = T^{-1}\operatorname{col}\begin{pmatrix}\hat{\mathbf{x}}_0 & \hat{\mathbf{x}}_1\end{pmatrix}$. Now, consider a fixed but arbitrary $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$. It follows from (i) that

$$S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0) \leq \sup_{t_1 \geq t_0, \mathbf{u}\in\mathcal{L}_2^{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R}^n)} -\int_{t_0}^{t_1} (\sigma(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y}))(t)dt,$$
$$\text{such that } (\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y},\hat{\mathbf{x}}) \in \hat{\mathcal{B}}_s, \hat{\mathbf{x}}(t_0) = T_1\mathbf{x}_0,$$

i.e., $S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0) \leq \hat{S}_a^\sigma(T_1\mathbf{x}_0)$. Similarly, from (ii), it can be shown that $S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0) \geq \hat{S}_a^\sigma(T_1\mathbf{x}_0)$, so $S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0) = \hat{S}_a^\sigma(T_1\mathbf{x}_0)$. Finally, if $V_o\mathbf{z} = 0$, then it is easily shown that $T_1\mathbf{z} = 0$, so $S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{z}) = \hat{S}_a^\sigma(0)$. Since $\hat{S}_a^\sigma$ is a storage function by Lemma 15, then $S_a^\sigma(\mathbf{z}) = 0$. ∎

VI. Passive systems and the available energy

With the results of the preceding section, we will now show Theorem 10.

Proof of Theorem 10: That $2 \iff 3$ is shown in [4]. Here, we prove $1 \Rightarrow 4 \Rightarrow 3 \Rightarrow 1$.

1 ⇒ 4 First, consider a $k > 0$ such that $I + kD$ is nonsingular. Then, let

$$\tilde{C} \coloneqq (I+kD)^{-1}C \text{ and } \tilde{A} \coloneqq A - kB(I+kD)^{-1}C; \quad (21)$$

let $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(t) = e^{\tilde{A}(t-t_0)}\mathbf{z}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$; and let $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} = -k\tilde{C}\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{y}} = \tilde{C}\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$. It can be verified that $(\tilde{\mathbf{u}},\tilde{\mathbf{y}},\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \in \mathcal{B}_s$, $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(t_0) = \mathbf{z}$, and $-\int_{t_0}^{t_1}(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}^T\tilde{\mathbf{y}})(t)dt = k\int_{t_0}^{t_1}(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^T\tilde{\mathbf{y}})(t)dt \geq 0$. Thus, $S_a^{\sigma_p}(\mathbf{x}_0) = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}_0^T X_-\mathbf{x}_0$ for some $X_- \in \mathbb{R}_s^{d\times d}$ with $X_- \geq 0$ by Lemma 16 (it is conventional to include the $\frac{1}{2}$). It remains to show that X_- satisfies conditions 4(ii)–(iv).

The proof of 4(iii) is inspired by [1, Proof of Lemma 1]. Note initially that if $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ then $X_-\mathbf{z} = 0 \iff \mathbf{z}^T X_-\mathbf{z} = 0 \iff S_a^{\sigma_p}(\mathbf{z}) = 0$, whence $V_o\mathbf{z} = 0 \Rightarrow X_-\mathbf{z} = 0$ by Lemma 18. Now, let $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}$, and $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ be as in the previous paragraph, so $-\int_{t_0}^{t_1}(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}^T\tilde{\mathbf{y}})(t)dt = k\int_{t_0}^{t_1}(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^T\tilde{\mathbf{y}})(t)dt \leq S_a(\mathbf{z})$. If $X_-\mathbf{z} = 0$, then $0 = S_a(\mathbf{z}) \geq k\int_{t_0}^{t_1}(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^T\tilde{\mathbf{y}})(t)dt$, so $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}(t) = \tilde{C}e^{\tilde{A}(t-t_0)}\mathbf{z} = 0$ for all $t \geq t_0$. This implies $\tilde{C}\tilde{A}^k\mathbf{z} = 0$ $(k = 0,1,2,\ldots)$, which implies $CA^k\mathbf{z} = 0$ $(k = 0,1,2,\ldots)$, hence $V_o\mathbf{z} = 0$.

To prove 4(ii), note from Lemma 15 that $S_a^{\sigma_p}$ is a storage function (with respect to $\mathbf{u}^T\mathbf{y}$). Thus, $S_a^{\sigma_p}(\mathbf{x}(t_1)) \leq \int_{t_0}^{t_1}(\mathbf{u}^T\mathbf{y})(t)dt + S_a^{\sigma_p}(\mathbf{x}(t_0))$ for all $(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $t_1 \geq t_0$. From the variation of the constants formula, for any given $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathbf{u}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, there exists a $(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_s$ with $\mathbf{x}$ differentiable, $\mathbf{x}(t_0) = \mathbf{x}_0$ and $\mathbf{u}(t_0) = \mathbf{u}_0$. Thus,

$$(\mathbf{u}^T\mathbf{y})(t_0) - \tfrac{d}{dt}(S_a^{\sigma_p}(\mathbf{x}))(t_0) = \tfrac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{x}_0\\ \mathbf{u}_0\end{bmatrix}^T \Omega(X_-)\begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{x}_0\\ \mathbf{u}_0\end{bmatrix} \geq 0,$$

and so $\Omega(X_-) \geq 0$.

To prove 4(iv), note that if $X \geq 0$ and $\Omega(X) \geq 0$, then

$$2\int_{t_0}^{t_1}(\mathbf{u}^T\mathbf{y})(t)dt - \left[(\mathbf{x}^TX\mathbf{x})(t)\right]_{t_0}^{t_1} = \int_{t_0}^{t_1}\left(\begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{x}^T & \mathbf{u}^T\end{bmatrix}\Omega(X)\operatorname{col}\begin{pmatrix}\mathbf{x} & \mathbf{u}\end{pmatrix}\right)(t)dt, \quad (22)$$

so $\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}(t_1)^TX\mathbf{x}(t_1) \leq \int_{t_0}^{t_1}(\mathbf{u}^T\mathbf{y})(t)dt + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}(t_0)^TX\mathbf{x}(t_0)$. With $S(\mathbf{x}_0) \coloneqq \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}_0^TX\mathbf{x}_0$ for all $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, it follows that S is a storage function. Thus, $\mathbf{x}_0^TX\mathbf{x}_0 \geq \mathbf{x}_0^TX_-\mathbf{x}_0$ for all $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ by Lemma 15, which implies $X \geq X_-$.

4 ⇒ 3 Immediate.

3 ⇒ 1 Recall from the proof of $1 \Rightarrow 4$(iv) that $S(\mathbf{x}_0) = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}_0^TX\mathbf{x}_0$ is a storage function (with respect to $\mathbf{u}^T\mathbf{y}$). Condition 1 then follows from Lemma 15.

It remains to show that if (C,A) is observable and conditions 1–4 hold, then (i) $\operatorname{spec}(A) \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$; and (ii) if $X \in \mathbb{R}_s^{d\times d}$ satisfies $\Omega(X) \geq 0$, then $X_- \leq X$.

Condition (i) follows from [2, Theorem 3.7.5], as condition 4 implies that $X_- > 0$ and $-A^TX_- - X_-A \geq 0$.

To see (ii), let $X \in \mathbb{R}_s^{d\times d}$ satisfy $\Omega(X) \geq 0$, and note that (22) holds. Then, for any given $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_s$ with $\mathbf{x}(t_0) = \mathbf{x}_0$ and $t_1 \geq t_0$ such that

$$-\int_{t_0}^{t_1}(\mathbf{u}^T\mathbf{y})(t)dt = S_a^{\sigma_p}(\mathbf{x}_0) - \epsilon \leq \tfrac{1}{2}(\mathbf{x}_0^TX\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{x}(t_1)^TX\mathbf{x}(t_1)).$$

We will show that there exists $M \in \mathbb{R}$ (independent of ϵ) such that $\mathbf{x}(t_1)^TX\mathbf{x}(t_1) \geq M\epsilon$. This implies that $\mathbf{x}_0^TX_-\mathbf{x}_0 \leq \mathbf{x}_0^TX\mathbf{x}_0 + \epsilon(1-M)$. Since ϵ can be chosen to be arbitrarily small, we conclude that $X_- \leq X$.

To obtain the bound M, we let $k > 0$ be such that $I + kD$ is invertible; $\tilde{C}$ and $\tilde{A}$ be as in (21); $\mathbf{x}(t_1) = \mathbf{x}_1$; and we let $(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}(t),\tilde{\mathbf{y}}(t),\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(t)) = (\mathbf{u}(t),\mathbf{y}(t),\mathbf{x}(t))$ for all $t_0 \leq t < t_1$, and $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(t) = e^{\tilde{A}(t-t_1)}\mathbf{x}_1$, $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}(t) = -k\tilde{C}\mathbf{x}(t)$, and $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}(t) = \tilde{C}\mathbf{x}(t)$ for all $t \geq t_1$. Then $(\tilde{\mathbf{u}},\tilde{\mathbf{y}},\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \in \mathcal{B}_s$ with $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(t_0) = \mathbf{x}_0$. Next, consider a fixed $T > 0$, and let $\tilde{\mathcal{O}} \coloneqq \int_0^T e^{\tilde{A}^T\tau}\tilde{C}^T\tilde{C}e^{\tilde{A}\tau}d\tau$. From earlier in the proof, $(\tilde{C},\tilde{A})$ is observable since (C,A) is, and so $\tilde{\mathcal{O}} > 0$. Moreover,

$$-\int_{t_0}^{t_1+T}(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}^T\tilde{\mathbf{y}})(t)dt = S_a^{\sigma_p}(\mathbf{x}_0) - \epsilon + k\mathbf{x}_1^T\tilde{\mathcal{O}}\mathbf{x}_1 \leq S_a^{\sigma_p}(\mathbf{x}_0),$$

so $\mathbf{x}_1^T\tilde{\mathcal{O}}\mathbf{x}_1 \leq \epsilon/k$. Now, let $\lambda > 0$ denote the least eigenvalue of $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$. Also, if $X \geq 0$ we let $\mu \coloneqq 0$, and otherwise we let $\mu < 0$ be the least (i.e., most negative) eigenvalue of X. By Rayleigh's quotient, $\mathbf{x}_1^TX\mathbf{x}_1 \geq \mu\mathbf{x}_1^T\mathbf{x}_1 \geq \frac{\mu}{\lambda}\mathbf{x}_1^T\tilde{\mathcal{O}}\mathbf{x}_1 \geq \frac{\mu\epsilon}{k\lambda}$ which gives the bound $M \coloneqq \mu/(k\lambda)$. ∎

VII. Explicit characterisation of the available energy

In this section, we prove Theorems 12 and 13. We also show how to compute the available energy of a passive system.

Proof of Theorem 12: With the notation

$$S(X) \coloneqq \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ (D+D^T)^{-1}(B^TX - C) & I\end{bmatrix}, \quad (23)$$

then $S(X)$ is nonsingular and

$$S(X)^T\Omega(X)S(X) = \begin{bmatrix}\Gamma(X) & 0\\ 0 & D+D^T\end{bmatrix}. \quad (24)$$

Thus, $\Omega(X) \geq 0 \iff \Gamma(X) \geq 0$.

2 ⇒ 1 From (24), $X_- \geq 0$ and $\Omega(X_-) \geq 0$, so $S_a^{\sigma_p}(\mathbf{x}_0) < \infty$ for all $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ by Theorem 10.

1 ⇒ 2 Since $S_a^{\sigma_p}(\mathbf{x}_0) < \infty$ for all $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then $S_a^{\sigma_p}(\mathbf{x}_0) = \mathbf{x}_0^TX_-\mathbf{x}_0$ for some $X_- \in \mathbb{R}_s^{d\times d}$ satisfying (i) $X_- \geq 0$, (ii) $\Omega(X_-) \geq 0$, and (iii) if $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then $X_-\mathbf{z} =$

$0 \iff V_o\mathbf{z}=0$, by Theorem 10. It remains to show that conditions 2(ii) and 2(iv) are also satisfied.

To show condition 2(ii), we let $\sigma(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y})=\mathbf{u}^T\mathbf{y}$. From the proof of Theorem 10, σ satisfies the conditions of Lemma 16, so (19) holds. Also, for any given $t_2 \geq t_1 \geq t_0$ and $(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_s$ with $\mathbf{x}(t_0)=\mathbf{x}_0$, then

$$\begin{aligned}-\textstyle\int_{t_0}^{t_2}\sigma(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y})(t)dt &\leq -\textstyle\int_{t_0}^{t_1}\sigma(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y})(t)dt + S_a^{\sigma_p}(\mathbf{x}(t_1))\\ &= S_a^{\sigma_p}(\mathbf{x}_0) - \tfrac{1}{2}\textstyle\int_{t_0}^{t_1}\left(\begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{x}^T & \mathbf{u}^T\end{bmatrix}\Omega(X_-)\mathrm{col}\begin{pmatrix}\mathbf{x} & \mathbf{u}\end{pmatrix}\right)(t)dt.\end{aligned}$$

By taking the supremum over all $t_2 \geq t_1$ and $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{L}_2^{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R}^n)$, and using (19), we find that

$$0 \leq \sup_{\mathbf{u}\in\mathcal{L}_2^{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R}^n)} -\textstyle\int_{t_0}^{t_1}\left(\begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{x}^T & \mathbf{u}^T\end{bmatrix}\Omega(X_-)\mathrm{col}\begin{pmatrix}\mathbf{x} & \mathbf{u}\end{pmatrix}\right)(t)dt$$
$$\text{such that } (\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_s, \mathbf{x}(t_0)=\mathbf{x}_0, \quad (25)$$

for any given $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $t_1 \geq t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, from (23)–(25), we find that

$$0 = \inf_{\mathbf{v}\in\mathcal{L}_2^{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R}^n)} -\textstyle\int_{t_0}^{t_1}(\mathbf{x}^T\Gamma(X_-)\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{v}^T(D+D^T)\mathbf{v})(t)dt$$
$$\text{such that } \mathbf{x} \in AC(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R}^d), \tfrac{d\mathbf{x}}{dt}=A_\Gamma(X_-)\mathbf{x}+B\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}(t_0)=\mathbf{x}_0.$$

From [19, Section 2.3], for any given $t_1 \geq t_0$, the above infimum is equal to $\mathbf{x}_0^T P(t_0-t_1)\mathbf{x}$, where P is an absolutely continuous matrix function which satisfies $P(0)=0$ and

$$\begin{aligned}-\tfrac{dP}{dt} &= PA_\Gamma(X_-) + A_\Gamma(X_-)^T P\\ &\quad - PB(D+D^T)^{-1}B^TP + \Gamma(X_-). \quad (26)\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ can be chosen arbitrarily, then $P(t)=\frac{dP}{dt}(t)=0$ for all $t<0$, and so $\Gamma(X_-)=0$ by (26).

To show condition 2(iv), we consider the cases: (i) (C,A) observable; and (ii) (C,A) not observable.

Case (i): (C,A) observable We note that $\begin{bmatrix}\lambda I - A & B\end{bmatrix}$ has full row rank for all $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$ (see Remark 11). This implies that $\begin{bmatrix}\lambda I - A_\Gamma(X_-) & B\end{bmatrix}$ has full row rank for all $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$, so $(A_\Gamma(X_-),B)$ is stabilizable [6, Theorem 5.2.27]. The proof of this condition is then identical to [3, Lemma 7].

Case (ii): (C,A) not observable Consider the observer staircase form (see Lemma 17), and let $\mathcal{B}_s$ and $\hat{S}_a^\sigma$ be as in Lemma 18 (for the case $\sigma(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y})=\sigma_p(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y})=\mathbf{u}^T\mathbf{y}$). It follows from Lemma 18 that $X_- = T^T\mathrm{diag}\begin{pmatrix}\hat{X}_- & 0\end{pmatrix}T$ where $\hat{X}_- \in \mathbb{R}_s^{\hat{d}\times\hat{d}}$ with $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_0^T\hat{X}_-\hat{\mathbf{x}}_0 = \hat{S}_a^{\sigma_p}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_0)$ for all $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{\hat{d}}$. With

$$\begin{aligned}&\hat{\Gamma}(\hat{X}) := -A_{11}^T\hat{X} - \hat{X}A_{11} - (C_1^T - \hat{X}B_1)(D+D^T)^{-1}(C_1 - B_1^T\hat{X}),\\ &\text{and } A_{\hat{\Gamma}}(\hat{X}) := A_{11} - B_1(D+D^T)^{-1}(C_1 - B_1^T\hat{X}), \quad (27)\end{aligned}$$

it follows from case (i) that $\hat{X}_- \geq 0$, $\hat{\Gamma}(\hat{X}_-)=0$, and $\mathrm{spec}(A_{\hat{\Gamma}}(\hat{X}_-)) \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$. Also, it can be verified that $\Gamma(X_-) = T^T\mathrm{diag}\begin{pmatrix}\hat{\Gamma}(\hat{X}_-) & 0\end{pmatrix}T$; and

$$TA_\Gamma(X_-)T^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix}A_{\hat{\Gamma}}(\hat{X}_-) & 0\\ \hat{A}_{21} & A_{22}\end{bmatrix},$$
$$\text{where } \hat{A}_{21} := A_{21} - B_2(D+D^T)^{-1}(C_1^T - B_1^T\hat{X}_-). \quad (28)$$

Now, suppose $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$ and $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^d$ satisfy $A_\Gamma(X_-)\mathbf{z}=\lambda\mathbf{z}$, and let T_1 be as in Lemma 17. Since $\lambda I - A_{\hat{\Gamma}}(\hat{X}_-)$ is nonsingular for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$, then (28) implies that $T_1\mathbf{z}=0$, and it is then easily shown that $V_o\mathbf{z}=0$.

It remains to show that if X_- satisfies condition 2, then $S_a^{\sigma_p}(\mathbf{x}_0)=\mathbf{x}_0^TX_-\mathbf{x}_0$. To prove this, we assume that (C,A) is observable, and we show that if $X \in \mathbb{R}_s^{d\times d}$ satisfies $X \geq 0$, $X \neq X_-$, and $\Gamma(X)=0$, then $\mathrm{spec}(A_\Gamma(X)) \notin \bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$. The case with (C,A) not observable can then be shown by considering the observer staircase form as in the proof of case (ii) above.

If $\Gamma(X)=0$, then $\Omega(X) \geq 0$, so $Y := X - X_- \geq 0$ by Theorem 10. Also, by direct calculation,

$$A_\Gamma(X_-)^TY + YA_\Gamma(X_-) + YB(D+D^T)^{-1}B^TY = 0.$$

From before, $(A_\Gamma(X_-),B)$ is stabilizable, so from [3, Proof of Lemma A.1] we find that $A_\Gamma(X_-)+B(D+D^T)^{-1}B^TY = A_\Gamma(X)$ satisfies $\mathrm{spec}(A_\Gamma(X)) \notin \bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$. ∎

Remark 19: Note from the proof of Theorems 10 and 12 that, in order to find the matrix X_- in that theorem, it suffices to find an $X_- \in \mathbb{R}_s^{d\times d}$ satisfying $\Gamma(X_-)=0$ and $\mathrm{spec}(A_\Gamma(X_-)) \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$ for the case with (C,A) observable. This can be obtained from the controller staircase form [2, Theorem 3.3.4]:

$$TAT^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix}A_{11} & A_{12}\\ 0 & A_{22}\end{bmatrix}, TB = \begin{bmatrix}B_1\\ 0\end{bmatrix}, CT^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix}C_1 & C_2\end{bmatrix}, \quad (29)$$

with (A_{11},B_1) controllable. Since (C,A) is observable, then so too is (C_1,A_{11}). Furthermore,

$$D + C_1(\xi I - A_{11})^{-1}B_1 = D + C(\xi I - A)^{-1}B, \quad (30)$$

which is positive-real (see Remark 11). Thus, with $\hat{\Gamma}$ and $A_{\hat{\Gamma}}$ as in (27), it follows from [1, Lemma 2] that there exists a unique $X_{11} > 0$ which satisfies $\hat{\Gamma}(X_{11})=0$ and $\mathrm{spec}(A_{\hat{\Gamma}}(X_{11})) \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$. This solution can be efficiently computed using the methods in [2, Chapter 6]. Next, note that $\begin{bmatrix}\lambda I - A & B\end{bmatrix}$ has full row rank for all $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$ (see Remark 11), and from (29) we conclude that $\mathrm{spec}(A_{22}) \in \mathbb{C}_-$. Thus, from [2, Theorem 3.7.4], there exists a unique real X_{12}^T satisfying the Sylvester equation:

$$\begin{aligned}&A_{22}^TX_{12}^T + X_{12}^TA_{\hat{\Gamma}}(X_{11})\\ &\qquad = -A_{12}^TX_{11} - C_2^T(D+D^T)^{-1}(C_1 - B_1^TX_{11}),\end{aligned}$$

and a unique real $Z \geq 0$ satisfying the Lyapunov equation:

$$\begin{aligned}&-(A_{22}^TZ + ZA_{22})\\ &\quad = (C_2^T - X_{12}^TX_{11}^{-1}C_1^T)(D+D^T)^{-1}(C_2 - C_1X_{11}^{-1}X_{12}).\end{aligned}$$

Then, with the notation

$$\hat{A}_{12} := A_{12} - B_1(D+D^T)^{-1}(C_2 - B_1^TX_{12}),$$
$$\text{and } X_- = T^T\begin{bmatrix}X_{11} & X_{12}\\ X_{12}^T & Z + X_{12}^TX_{11}^{-1}X_{12}\end{bmatrix}T,$$

it can be verified that $X_- \geq 0$, $\Gamma(X_-)=0$, and

$$TA_\Gamma(X_-)T^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix}A_{\hat{\Gamma}}(X_{11}) & \hat{A}_{12}\\ 0 & A_{22}\end{bmatrix}.$$

This implies that $\mathrm{spec}(A_\Gamma(X_-)) = \mathrm{spec}(A_{\hat{\Gamma}}(X_{11})) \cup \mathrm{spec}(A_{22}) \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$, and so X_- is the matrix in Theorem 12.

To prove Theorem 13, we use the following two lemmas.

Lemma 20: Let $P \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}[\xi]$ and $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m}[\xi]$ where Q is nonsingular and $Q^{-1}P$ is proper, and let

$$\mathcal{B}=\{(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y})\in\mathcal{L}_2^{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R}^n)\times\mathcal{L}_2^{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R}^m) \mid P(\tfrac{d}{dt})\mathbf{u}=Q(\tfrac{d}{dt})\mathbf{y}\}.$$

Then there exists $\mathcal{B}_s$ as in (1) and polynomial matrices M, N, U, V, E, F such that, with the notation $\mathcal{A}(\xi) = \xi I - A$,

1. $\begin{bmatrix} M & N \\ U & V \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} -D & I & -C \\ -B & 0 & \mathcal{A} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -P & Q & 0 \\ -E & -F & I \end{bmatrix}$; and
2. condition 2 of Lemma 4 holds.

In particular, (i) (C, A) is observable, and (ii) $\mathcal{B}_s^{(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y})} = \mathcal{B}$. Also, whenever $\mathcal{B}_s$ is as in (1) and satisfies conditions (i) and (ii), then there exist polynomial matrices M, N, U, V, E, F satisfying conditions 1 and 2, and we say that (A, B, C, D) is an observable realization of (P, Q). Finally, if $(\hat{A}, \hat{B}, \hat{C}, \hat{D})$ is another observable realization of (P, Q), then there exists a nonsingular $T\in\mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ such that

$$\hat{A} = TAT^{-1},\ \hat{B} = TB,\ \hat{C} = CT^{-1},\ \text{and}\ \hat{D} = D. \qquad (31)$$

Proof: The existence of $\mathcal{B}_s, M, N, U, V, E, F$ with the properties outlined in the lemma statement follows from [9, Sections 4–5]. Next, note that it is easily shown from the final block column in condition 1 that if there exists $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $C\mathbf{z} = 0$ and $(\lambda I - A)\mathbf{z} = 0$, then $\mathbf{z} = 0$. Condition (i) then follows from [6, Theorem 5.3.15]. Condition (ii) follows from Lemma 4. Now, let $(\hat{A}, \hat{B}, \hat{C}, \hat{D})$ be another observable realization of (P, Q), let $\hat{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{\hat{d}\times\hat{d}}$, let V_o be as in (11), and let $\hat{V}_o \coloneqq \operatorname{col}\begin{pmatrix}\hat{C} & \hat{C}\hat{A} & \cdots & \hat{C}\hat{A}^{d-1}\end{pmatrix}$. It follows from the variation of the constants formula that, for any given $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, there exists $\hat{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\hat{d}}$ such that $\hat{C}e^{\hat{A}t}\hat{\mathbf{z}} = Ce^{At}\mathbf{z}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose initially that $\hat{d} \le d$. Since $\mathbf{z}$ is arbitrary, there must exist $T \in \mathbb{R}^{\hat{d}\times d}$ such that $\hat{C}\hat{A}^kT = CA^k$ $(k = 0, 1, \ldots)$. In particular, $V_o = \hat{V}_oT$. As (C, A) and $(\hat{C}, \hat{A})$ are observable, then V_o and $\hat{V}_o$ have full column rank, so $\hat{d} = d$ and $T \coloneqq (\hat{V}_o^T\hat{V}_o)^{-1}\hat{V}_o^TV_o$ is nonsingular (with $T^{-1} = (V_o^TV_o)^{-1}V_o^T\hat{V}_o$). In particular, $\hat{C} = CT^{-1}$. Also, since $V_oA = \hat{V}_o\hat{A}T$, then $\hat{A} = TAT^{-1}$. Finally, from the variation of the constants formula, we require $V_oB = \hat{V}_o\hat{B}$, which implies $\hat{B} = TB$. A similar argument applies in the case $\hat{d} \ge d$, and completes the proof. ∎

Lemma 21: Let $\mathcal{B}_s$ and G be as in (1) and (7) with $m = n$; let $\operatorname{spec}(A) \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$; let X_-, L and W be real matrices which satisfy condition 2(iiia) of Theorem 13; and let

$$Z(\xi) \coloneqq W + L(\xi I - A)^{-1}B \text{ and } Y(\xi) \coloneqq \begin{bmatrix} \xi I - A & -B \\ L & W \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then $Z^\star Z{=}G{+}G^\star$, and Z is a spectral factor for $G + G^\star$ if and only if $Y(\lambda)$ has full row rank for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$.

Proof: That $Z^\star Z = G + G^\star$ follows by pre-multiplying $\Omega(X)$ in (14) by $\begin{bmatrix}B^T(-\xi I - A^T)^{-1} & I\end{bmatrix}$ and post-multiplying by $\operatorname{col}\begin{pmatrix}(\xi I - A)^{-1}B & I\end{pmatrix}$. Since $\operatorname{spec}(A) \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$, then Z is analytic in $\mathbb{C}_+$. Finally, consider a fixed but arbitrary $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$, so $\lambda I - A$ is nonsingular, and note that

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & \lambda I - A \\ Z(\lambda) & L \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda I - A & -B \\ L & W \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} (\lambda I - A)^{-1}B & I \\ I & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The rightmost matrix in this equation is nonsingular, so $Y(\lambda)$ has full row rank for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$ if and only if $Z(\lambda)$ does, in which case Z is a spectral factor for $G + G^\star$. ∎

Proof of Theorem 13: That $2 \Rightarrow 1$ is immediate from Theorem 10, since $X_- \ge 0$ satisfies $\Omega(X_-) \ge 0$. It remains to show that $1 \Rightarrow 2$, and if X_- has the properties indicated in condition 2 then $S_a^{\sigma_p}(\mathbf{x}_0) = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}_0^TX_-\mathbf{x}_0$. We will prove this for the cases: (i) (C, A) observable and $D{+}D^T > 0$; (ii) (C, A) observable; and finally (iii) (C, A) not observable.

Case (i) (C, A) observable and $D{+}D^T > 0$ It suffices to show that X_- satisfies condition 2 in Theorem 12 if and only if X_- satisfies condition 2 in the present theorem.

First, let X_- satisfy condition 2 in Theorem 12. Since $D + D^T > 0$, then there exists a nonsingular W satisfying $W^TW = D + D^T$. We let $L \coloneqq (W^T)^{-1}(C - B^TX_-)$, and we obtain $-A^TX_- - X_-^TA - L^TL = \Gamma(X_-) = 0$.

Now, let $Z(\xi)\coloneqq W{+}L(\xi I{-}A)^{-1}B$. From Theorems 10 and 12, $\operatorname{spec}(A)\in\bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$ and $\operatorname{spec}(A_\Gamma(X_-))\in\bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$. Also,

$$\begin{bmatrix} \lambda I{-}A & -B \\ L & W \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda I{-}A_\Gamma(X_-) & -B \\ 0 & W \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ W^{-1}L & I \end{bmatrix}. \qquad (32)$$

The matrices in (32) have full row rank for all $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$, so Z is a spectral factor for $G + G^\star$ by Lemma 21.

Next, let X_- satisfy condition 2 in the present theorem. Since $W + L(\xi I - A)^{-1}B$ is a spectral factor of $G + G^\star$, then W is nonsingular. Thus, $L = (W^T)^{-1}(C - B^TX_-)$, and $\Gamma(X_-) = -A^TX_- - X_-A - L^TL = 0$. As before, $\operatorname{spec}(A) \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$, so the matrices in (32) have full row rank for all $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$ by Lemma 21, and so $\operatorname{spec}(A_\Gamma(X_-)) \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$.

Case (ii) (C, A) observable Let P and Q be as in Theorem 10, and let $P_1 \coloneqq P$ and $Q_1 \coloneqq Q$. If P_1 and Q_1 do not satisfy the conditions of case (i), then we will construct $P_m, Q_m \in \mathbb{R}^{n_m\times n_m}[\xi]$ which do. Specifically, we consider the following four statements:

(R1) $P_i, Q_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i\times n_i}[\xi]$ where (P_i, Q_i) is a positive-real pair and $Q_i^{-1}P_i$ is proper.

(R2) $D_i \coloneqq \lim_{\xi\to\infty}(Q_i^{-1}P_i(\xi))$ is symmetric.

(R3) P_i is nonsingular and $D_i = \operatorname{diag}\begin{pmatrix}I_{r_i} & 0\end{pmatrix}$.

(R4) $D_i = I$ or $n_i = 0$.

By Theorem 10, P_1 and Q_1 satisfy condition (R1). Then, using Lemmas 22–24 (which follow this proof), we construct $P_2, \ldots, P_m$, $Q_2, \ldots, Q_m$ such that condition (R1) is satisfied, $n_i{\le}n_{i-1}$, and $\deg(\det(Q_i))\le\deg(\det(Q_{i-1}))$, for $i = 2, \ldots, m$; and

1) If, for $i = k{-}1$, (R2) is not satisfied, then (R2) is satisfied for $i = k$ (Lemma 22).
2) If, for $i = k{-}1$, (R2) is satisfied but (R3) is not, then (R2) and (R3) are satisfied for $i = k$; and if P_{k-1} is singular then $n_k < n_{k-1}$ (Lemma 23).
3) If, for $i = k{-}1$, (R2) and (R3) are satisfied but (R4) is not, then $\deg(\det(Q_k)) < \deg(\det(Q_{k-1}))$ (Lemma 24).

This inductive procedure terminates in a finite number of steps with matrices P_m and Q_m which satisfy conditions (R1)–(R4).

Next, we consider the following four statements:

(S1) There exist polynomial matrices $M_i, N_i, U_i, V_i, E_i, F_i$ such that $\begin{bmatrix} M_i & N_i \\ U_i & V_i \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} -D_i & I & -C_i \\ -B_i & 0 & \mathcal{A}_i \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -P_i & Q_i & 0 \\ -E_i & -F_i & I \end{bmatrix}$, where $\mathcal{A}_i(\xi) \coloneqq \xi I{-}A_i$, and the leftmost matrix is unimodular.

(S2) With $\Omega_i(X) \coloneqq \begin{bmatrix} -A_i^TX{-}XA_i & C_i^T{-}XB_i \\ C_i{-}B_i^TX & D_i{+}D_i^T \end{bmatrix}$, then X_i is a real matrix which satisfies (i) $X_i \ge 0$; (ii) $\Omega_i(X_i) \ge 0$;

and (iii) if X is a real matrix which satisfies $X \geq 0$ and $\Omega_i(X) \geq 0$, then $X_i \leq X$.

(S3) X_i, L_i and W_i are real matrices such that $X_i \geq 0$ and $\Omega_i(X_i)=\begin{bmatrix} -A_i^T X_i - X_i A_i & C_i^T - X_i B_i \\ C_i - B_i^T X_i & D_i + D_i^T \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} L_i^T \\ W_i^T \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} L_i & W_i \end{bmatrix}$.

(S4) $\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{A}_i(\lambda) & -B_i \\ L_i & W_i \end{bmatrix}$ has full row rank for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$.

From Lemma 20, there exist real matrices A_m, B_m, C_m, D_m such that condition (S1) holds for $i = m$. Thus, from case (i), there exist unique matrices X_m, L_m and W_m which satisfy conditions (S3) and (S4) for the case $i = m$. Furthermore, by Theorem 10, this X_m also satisfies condition (S2) for the case $i = m$. Then, using Lemmas 22–24, we find that there exist unique matrices X_i, L_i and W_i which satisfy conditions (S3) and (S4), and these X_i also satisfy condition (S2) ($i = m-1, \ldots, 1$). Now, let

$$\hat{\mathcal{B}}_s := \{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}_1) \in \mathcal{L}_2^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{L}_2^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \times AC\left(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^{d_1}\right) \mid \tfrac{d\mathbf{x}_1}{dt} = A_1 \mathbf{x}_1 + B_1 \mathbf{u} \text{ and } \mathbf{y} = C_1 \mathbf{x}_1 + D_1 \mathbf{u}\}.$$

Since $P = P_1$ and $Q = Q_1$, then from Lemma 20 we conclude that (C_1, A_1) is observable and $\hat{\mathcal{B}}_s^{(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y})} = \mathcal{B}_s^{(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y})}$, so there exists a nonsingular $T \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that (31) holds. It can then be verified that $X_- := T^T X_1 T$, $L := L_1 T$, and $W := W_1$ satisfy condition 2 in the present theorem statement; and X_- satisfies (i) $\Omega(X_-) \geq 0$; and (ii) if $X \in \mathbb{R}_s^{d \times d}$ satisfies $X \geq 0$ and $\Omega(X) \geq 0$, then $X_- \leq X$. Since X_- is uniquely determined by conditions (i)–(ii), then $S_a(\mathbf{x}_0) = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}_0^T X_- \mathbf{x}_0$ by Theorem 10.

Case (iii) (C, A) not observable Consider the observer staircase form (see Lemma 17), so (30) holds, and let $\hat{\mathcal{B}}_s$ and $\hat{S}_a^\sigma$ be as in Lemma 18 (for the case $\sigma(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}) = \sigma_p(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{y}$). It follows from Lemma 18 that $X_- = T^T \text{diag}\begin{pmatrix} \hat{X}_- & 0 \end{pmatrix} T$ where $\hat{X}_- \in \mathbb{R}_s^{\hat{d} \times \hat{d}}$ with $\frac{1}{2}\hat{\mathbf{x}}_0^T \hat{X}_- \hat{\mathbf{x}}_0 = \hat{S}_a^{\sigma_p}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_0)$ for all $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{\hat{d}}$. From case (ii), $\hat{X}_-$ is the unique real matrix satisfying (a) $\hat{X}_- \geq 0$; and (b) there exist real matrices $\hat{L}$, $\hat{W}$ such that

(b1) $-A_{11}^T \hat{X}_- - \hat{X}_- A_{11} = \hat{L}^T \hat{L}$, $C_1 - B_1^T \hat{X}_- = \hat{W}^T \hat{L}$, and $D + D^T = \hat{W}^T \hat{W}$; and

(b2) $\hat{W} + \hat{L}(\xi I - A_{11})^{-1} B_1$ is a spectral factor of $G + G^\star$.

Then, with $L := [\hat{L} \ 0]T$, and $W := \hat{W}$, it can be verified that condition 2 of the present theorem statement holds. Also, if X_-, L and W are real matrices satisfying condition 2, then $X_- = T^T \text{diag}\begin{pmatrix} \hat{X}_- & 0 \end{pmatrix} T$ for some $0 \leq \hat{X}_- \in \mathbb{R}_s^{\hat{d} \times \hat{d}}$ with

$$\begin{bmatrix} (T^{-1})^T & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} -A^T X_- - X_- A & C^T - X_- B \\ C - B^T X_- & D + D^T \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} (T^{-1}) & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} = \left[\begin{array}{cc|c} -A_{11}^T \hat{X}_- - \hat{X}_- A_{11} & 0 & C_1^T - \hat{X}_- B_1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline C_1 - B_1^T \hat{X}_- & 0 & D + D^T \end{array}\right].$$

This implies that $L = [\hat{L} \ 0]T$, and $W = \hat{W}$ where $\hat{L}$ and $\hat{W}$ satisfy the aforementioned conditions (b1) and (b2). Then, from case (ii) and Lemma 18, $S_a^{\sigma_p}(\mathbf{x}_0) = \hat{S}_a^{\sigma_p}(T_1 \mathbf{x}_0) = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}_0^T T_1^T \hat{X}_- T_1 \mathbf{x}_0 = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}_0^T X_- \mathbf{x}_0$ for all $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$. ∎

We now state and prove Lemmas 22–24.

Lemma 22: Let P_{k-1}, Q_{k-1} satisfy (R1) for $i = k-1$, and let $D_{k-1} := \lim_{\xi \to \infty}(Q_{k-1}^{-1} P_{k-1}(\xi))$. The following hold.

1. Let $P_k := P_{k-1} - \frac{1}{2}Q_{k-1}(D_{k-1} - D_{k-1}^T)$ and $Q_k := Q_{k-1}$. Then (R1) and (R2) hold for $i = k$.
2. Let A_k, B_k, C_k, D_k satisfy (S1) for $i{=}k$; and let $A_{k-1}{:=}A_k$, $B_{k-1}{:=}B_k$, and $C_{k-1}{:=}C_k$. Then:
   a) (S1) holds for $i{=}k{-}1$.
   b) Let $X_{k-1}, L_{k-1}, W_{k-1}, X_k, L_k$, and W_k be real matrices with $X_k = X_{k-1} \geq 0$, $L_k = L_{k-1}$, and $W_k = W_{k-1}$. Then (i) (S3) holds for $i = k{-}1$ if and only if (S3) holds for $i = k$; and (ii) (S4) holds for $i = k{-}1$ if and only if (S4) holds for $i = k$.

Proof: **Condition 1** Clearly, $Q_k^{-1} P_k = Q_{k-1}^{-1} P_{k-1} - \frac{1}{2}(D_{k-1} - D_{k-1}^T)$, so $Q_k^{-1} P_k$ is proper and $\lim_{\xi \to \infty}(Q_k^{-1} P_k(\xi)) = \lim_{\xi \to \infty}(Q_{k-1}^{-1} P_{k-1}(\xi)) - \frac{1}{2}(D_{k-1} - D_{k-1}^T) = \frac{1}{2}(D_{k-1} + D_{k-1}^T)$. Next, let

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2}(D_{k-1} - D_{k-1}^T) & I \end{bmatrix}.$$

This satisfies the conditions of note A2, so (P_k, Q_k) is a positive-real pair.

Condition 2 Let $\mathcal{A}_k, M_k, N_k, U_k, V_k, E_k, F_k$ be as in (S1) for the case $i = k$; and let $E_{k-1} := E_k - \frac{1}{2}F_k(D_{k-1} - D_{k-1}^T)$, $F_{k-1} := F_k$, $M_{k-1} := M_k$, $N_{k-1} := N_k$, $U_{k-1} := U_k$, and $V_{k-1} := V_k$. By post-multiplying both sides of the relationship in (S1) for the case $i{=}k$ by $\text{diag}\begin{pmatrix} S^{-1} & I \end{pmatrix}$, we find that (S1) holds for $i{=}k{-}1$. Finally, condition 2b follows since $D_k + D_k^T = D_{k-1} + D_{k-1}^T$. Thus, with $\Omega_i(X_i)$ as in (S3), then $\Omega_k(X_k) = \Omega_{k-1}(X_{k-1})$. ∎

Lemma 23: Let P_{k-1}, Q_{k-1} satisfy (R1)–(R2) for $i{=}k{-}1$, and let $n_k := \text{normalrank}(P_{k-1})$, $m_k := n_{k-1} - n_k$, and $r_k{:=}\text{rank}(D_{k-1})$. The following hold.

1. There exists a nonsingular $T \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{k-1} \times n_{k-1}}$; unimodular $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{k-1} \times n_{k-1}}[\xi]$ and $\tilde{Q}_{22} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_k \times m_k}[\xi]$; $\tilde{Q}_{12} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_k \times m_k}[\xi]$; and P_k, Q_k satisfying (R1)–(R3) for $i{=}k$, with
$$Y P_{k-1} T = \begin{bmatrix} P_k & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, Y Q_{k-1} (T^{-1})^T = \begin{bmatrix} Q_k & \tilde{Q}_{12} \\ 0 & \tilde{Q}_{22} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (33)$$
2. Let A_k, B_k, C_k, D_k satisfy (S1) for $i{=}k$; and $A_{k-1}{:=}A_k$, $B_{k-1}{:=}\begin{bmatrix} B_k & 0 \end{bmatrix} T^{-1}$, $C_{k-1}{:=}(T^{-1})^T \text{col}\begin{pmatrix} C_k & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, and $D_{k-1}{:=}(T^{-1})^T \text{diag}\begin{pmatrix} D_k & 0 \end{pmatrix} T^{-1}$. Then:
   a) (S1) holds for $i = k{-}1$.
   b) Let X_{k-1}, L_{k-1} and W_{k-1} satisfy (S3) for $i = k{-}1$; partition T as $T =: \begin{bmatrix} T_1 & T_2 \end{bmatrix}$ with $T_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{k-1} \times n_k}$ and $T_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{k-1} \times m_k}$; and let $X_k := X_{k-1}, L_k := L_{k-1}$, and $W_k := W_{k-1} T_1$. Then (i) $W_{k-1} T_2 = 0$; (ii) (S3) holds for $i = k$; and (iii) if (S4) holds for $i = k{-}1$, then (S4) holds for $i = k$.
   c) Let X_k, L_k and W_k satisfy (S3) for $i = k$; and let $X_{k-1} := X_k, L_{k-1} := L_k$, and $W_{k-1} := \begin{bmatrix} W_k & 0 \end{bmatrix} T^{-1}$. Then (i) (S3) holds for $i = k{-}1$; and (ii) if (S4) holds for $i = k$, then (S4) holds for $i = k{-}1$.

Proof: **Condition 1** Since (P_{k-1}, Q_{k-1}) is a positive-real pair and Q_{k-1} is nonsingular, then $G := Q_{k-1}^{-1} P_{k-1}$ is positive-real (see Remark 11). Since, in addition, D_{k-1} is symmetric, then $D_{k-1} \geq 0$ by Theorem 10, so there exists $T_{1a} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{k-1} \times r_k}$ such that $D_{k-1} = T_{1a}^T T_{1a}$. Now, let the columns of $T_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{k-1} \times m_k}$ be a basis for the nullspace of G (i.e., T_2 has full column rank and $G T_2 = 0$). Then,

since the nullspace of D_{k-1} is contained in the nullspace of G, there exists $T_{1b} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{k-1}\times(n_k-r_k)}$ such that the columns of $\begin{bmatrix}T_{1b} & T_2\end{bmatrix}$ are a basis for the nullspace of D_{k-1}. With $T_1 = \begin{bmatrix}T_{1a} & T_{1b}\end{bmatrix}$, it follows that $T = \begin{bmatrix}T_1 & T_2\end{bmatrix}$ is nonsingular. Also, from [2, Theorem 8.4.1], $T^TGT = \operatorname{diag}\begin{pmatrix}\hat{G} & 0\end{pmatrix}$, where $\hat{G} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_k\times n_k}(\xi)$ is positive-real and nonsingular.

From [6, Theorem B.1.1], there exists a unimodular $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{k-1}\times n_{k-1}}[\xi]$ such that $\tilde{Q} \coloneqq YQ_{k-1}(T^{-1})^T$ is upper triangular. Let $P \coloneqq YP_{k-1}T$, and note that $\tilde{Q}$ is nonsingular with $\tilde{Q}^{-1}\tilde{P} = T^TGT = \operatorname{diag}\begin{pmatrix}\hat{G} & 0\end{pmatrix}$. Since $\tilde{P} = \tilde{Q}\operatorname{diag}\begin{pmatrix}\hat{G} & 0\end{pmatrix}$, then $\tilde{P}$ and $\tilde{Q}$ (partitioned compatibly with $\operatorname{diag}\begin{pmatrix}\hat{G} & 0\end{pmatrix}$) take the form indicated in (33). To show that $\tilde{Q}_{22}$ in (33) is unimodular, we let $\lambda\in\mathbb{C}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{p}}\in\mathbb{R}^{n_{k-1}-n_k}[\xi]$ satisfy $\hat{\mathbf{p}}(\lambda)^T\tilde{Q}_{22}(\lambda)=0$ and $\mathbf{p}^T\coloneqq\begin{bmatrix}0 & \hat{\mathbf{p}}^T\end{bmatrix}\hat{Y}$. It can be verified that $\mathbf{p}^T(P_{k-1}Q_{k-1}^\star + Q_{k-1}P_{k-1}^\star) = 0$ and $\mathbf{p}(\lambda)^T\begin{bmatrix}P_{k-1} & -Q_{k-1}\end{bmatrix}(\lambda) = 0$. Since (P_{k-1}, Q_{k-1}) is a positive-real pair, this implies $\mathbf{p}(\lambda) = 0$. Since, in addition, $\hat{Y}$ is unimodular, then $\hat{\mathbf{p}}(\lambda) = 0$, so $\tilde{Q}_{22}$ is unimodular. It is then easily shown from notes A1 and A2 that (P_k, Q_k) is a positive-real pair. Moreover, $T^TGT = T^TQ_{k-1}^{-1}P_{k-1}T = \operatorname{diag}\begin{pmatrix}Q_k^{-1}P_k & 0\end{pmatrix} = \operatorname{diag}\begin{pmatrix}\hat{G} & 0\end{pmatrix}$ where $\hat{G}$ is nonsingular and $\lim_{\xi\to\infty}(\hat{G}(\xi)) = \operatorname{diag}\begin{pmatrix}I_{r_k} & 0\end{pmatrix}$. Thus, P_k, Q_k satisfy (R1)–(R3) for $i = k$.

Condition 2 Let $\mathcal{A}_k, M_k, N_k, U_k, V_k, E_k, F_k$ be as in (S1) for the case $i = k$; and let

$$\begin{bmatrix}M_{k-1} & N_{k-1}\\ U_{k-1} & V_{k-1}\end{bmatrix} \coloneqq \begin{bmatrix}Y^{-1} & 0\\ 0 & I\end{bmatrix}\left[\begin{array}{cc|c} M_k & \tilde{Q}_{12} & N_k\\ 0 & \tilde{Q}_{22} & 0\\ \hline U_k & 0 & V_k\end{array}\right]\begin{bmatrix}T^T & 0\\ 0 & I\end{bmatrix}.$$

The lines in the above matrix indicate the partition (a similar convention will be used in subsequent block matrix equations). It can be verified that each of these four matrices is unimodular. Also, with $\mathcal{A}_i$ as in (S1) for $i = k-1$ and $i = k$, then

$$\begin{bmatrix}T_2^T & 0\\ 0 & I\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}-D_{k-1} & I & -C_{k-1}\\ -B_{k-1} & 0 & \mathcal{A}_{k-1}\end{bmatrix} = \left[\begin{array}{cc|c} -D_k & 0 & -C_k\\ 0 & 0 & I\\ \hline -B_k & 0 & \mathcal{A}_k\end{array}\right]\begin{bmatrix}T^{-1} & 0 & 0\\ 0 & T^T & 0\\ 0 & 0 & I\end{bmatrix}.$$

Thus, with $E_{k-1} \coloneqq \begin{bmatrix}E_k & 0\end{bmatrix}T^{-1}$ and $F_{k-1} \coloneqq \begin{bmatrix}F_k & 0\end{bmatrix}T^T$, it can be verified that (S1) holds for $i{=}k{-}1$. To see 2b, note initially that $T_2^TW_{k-1}^TW_{k-1}T_2 = T_2^T(D_{k-1} + D_{k-1}^T)T_2 = 0$, so $W_{k-1}T_2 = 0$. Next, note that

$$\left[\begin{array}{c|cc}\mathcal{A}_k & -B_k & 0\\ L_k & W_k & 0\end{array}\right] = \begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{A}_{k-1} & -B_{k-1}\\ L_{k-1} & W_{k-1}\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}I & 0\\ 0 & T\end{bmatrix}. \tag{34}$$

We denote the rightmost matrix in (34) by S; we let $\Omega_{k-1}(X_{k-1})$ and $\Omega_k(X_k)$ be as in (S3), and we note that $S^T\Omega_{k-1}(X_{k-1})S = \operatorname{diag}\begin{pmatrix}\Omega_k(X_k) & 0\end{pmatrix}$. This shows 2b(ii). Also, since S is nonsingular, then 2b(iii) holds. The proof of 2c is similar, noting that (34) also holds in this case. ∎

Lemma 24: Let P_{k-1}, Q_{k-1} satisfy (R1)–(R3) for $i{=}k{-}1$, with $m_k \coloneqq n_{k-1} - r_{k-1} > 0$. The following hold.

1. There exists $0 < K \in \mathbb{R}^{m_k\times m_k}$ such that $\lim_{\xi\to\infty}(\frac{1}{\xi}P_{k-1}^{-1}Q_{k-1}(\xi)) = \operatorname{diag}\begin{pmatrix}0 & K\end{pmatrix}$.
2. Let $P_k(\xi) \coloneqq Q_{k-1}(\xi) - P_{k-1}(\xi)\operatorname{diag}\begin{pmatrix}0 & K\xi\end{pmatrix}$, and $Q_k \coloneqq P_{k-1}$. Then (R1) holds for $i = k$; $\deg(\det(Q_k)) < \deg(\det(Q_{k-1}))$; and there exist $\hat{D}_{12} \in \mathbb{R}^{r_{k-1}\times m_k}, \hat{D}_{21} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_k\times r_{k-1}}, \hat{D}_{22} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_k\times m_k}$ such that

$$\lim_{\xi\to\infty}(Q_k^{-1}P_k(\xi)) =: D_k = \begin{bmatrix}I_{r_{k-1}} & \hat{D}_{12}\\ \hat{D}_{21} & \hat{D}_{22}\end{bmatrix}. \tag{35}$$

3. Let A_k, B_k, C_k, D_k satisfy (S1) for $i = k$; partition B_k, C_k compatibly with D_k as $B_k = \begin{bmatrix}\hat{B}_1 & \hat{B}_2\end{bmatrix}$, $C_k = \operatorname{col}\begin{pmatrix}\hat{C}_1 & \hat{C}_2\end{pmatrix}$; and let

$$A_{k-1} \coloneqq \begin{bmatrix}A_k - \hat{B}_1\hat{C}_1 & \hat{B}_2K^{-1} - \hat{B}_1\hat{D}_{12}K^{-1}\\ \hat{D}_{21}\hat{C}_1 - \hat{C}_2 & \hat{D}_{21}\hat{D}_{12}K^{-1} - \hat{D}_{22}K^{-1}\end{bmatrix},$$

$$B_{k-1} \coloneqq \begin{bmatrix}\hat{B}_1 & 0\\ -\hat{D}_{21} & I\end{bmatrix}, \text{ and } C_{k-1} \coloneqq \begin{bmatrix}-\hat{C}_1 & -\hat{D}_{12}K^{-1}\\ 0 & K^{-1}\end{bmatrix}.$$

Then:

a) (S1) holds for $i = k{-}1$.
b) Let X_{k-1}, L_{k-1} and W_{k-1} satisfy (S3) for $i = k{-}1$; partition L_{k-1} and W_{k-1} compatibly with $A_{k-1}, B_{k-1}, C_{k-1}$ and D_{k-1} as $L_{k-1} \coloneqq \begin{bmatrix}\tilde{L}_1 & \tilde{L}_2\end{bmatrix}$ and $W_{k-1} \coloneqq \begin{bmatrix}\tilde{W}_1 & \tilde{W}_2\end{bmatrix}$; and let $L_k \coloneqq \tilde{L}_1 + \tilde{W}_1\hat{C}_1$, and $W_k \coloneqq \begin{bmatrix}\tilde{W}_1 & \tilde{L}_2K + \tilde{W}_1\hat{D}_{12}\end{bmatrix}$. Then (i) $\tilde{W}_2 = 0$; (ii) X_{k-1} has the form $X_{k-1} = \operatorname{diag}\begin{pmatrix}X_k & K^{-1}\end{pmatrix}$; (iii) with X_k as in condition (ii), then (S3) holds for $i = k$; and (iv) if (S4) holds for $i = k{-}1$, then (S4) holds for $i = k$.
c) Let X_k, L_k and W_k satisfy (S3) for $i = k$; partition W_k compatibly with D_k as $W_k = \begin{bmatrix}\hat{W}_1 & \hat{W}_2\end{bmatrix}$; and let $L_{k-1} \coloneqq \begin{bmatrix}L_k - \hat{W}_1\hat{C}_1 & (\hat{W}_2 - \hat{W}_1\hat{D}_{12})K^{-1}\end{bmatrix}$, $W_{k-1} \coloneqq \begin{bmatrix}\hat{W}_1 & 0\end{bmatrix}$ and $X_{k-1} \coloneqq \operatorname{diag}\begin{pmatrix}X_k & K^{-1}\end{pmatrix}$. Then (i) (S3) holds for $i = k{-}1$; and (ii) if (S4) holds for $i = k$, then (S4) holds for $i = k{-}1$.

Proof: **Condition 1** Since (P_{k-1}, Q_{k-1}) is a positive-real pair and P_{k-1} is nonsingular, then $P_{k-1}^{-1}Q_{k-1}$ is positive-real. Thus, if $P_{k-1}^{-1}Q_{k-1}$ has a pole at infinity, then it is simple and the residue matrix $J \coloneqq \lim_{\xi\to\infty}(\frac{1}{\xi}(P_{k-1}^{-1}Q_{k-1})(\xi))$ is real and non-negative definite [2, Theorem 2.7.2]. Thus, there exist real matrices $J, \hat{D}$ and strictly proper real-rational matrices G, H (partitioned compatibly with D_{k-1}), such that

$$P_{k-1}^{-1}Q_{k-1}(\xi) = \begin{bmatrix}J_{11} & J_{12}\\ J_{12}^T & J_{22}\end{bmatrix}\xi + \begin{bmatrix}\hat{D}_{11} & \hat{D}_{12}\\ \hat{D}_{21} & \hat{D}_{22}\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}G_{11} & G_{12}\\ G_{21} & G_{22}\end{bmatrix}(\xi)$$

$$Q_{k-1}^{-1}P_{k-1}(\xi) = \begin{bmatrix}I_{r_{k-1}} & 0\\ 0 & 0\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}H_{11} & H_{12}\\ H_{21} & H_{22}\end{bmatrix}(\xi). \tag{36}$$

By considering the first block row in the equation $0 = \lim_{\xi\to\infty}(\frac{1}{\xi}(Q_{k-1}^{-1}P_{k-1}P_{k-1}^{-1}Q_{k-1})(\xi))$, we obtain $J_{11} = 0$ and $J_{12} = 0$. Then, by condidering the bottom right block in the equation $\lim_{\xi\to\infty}((P_{k-1}^{-1}Q_{k-1}Q_{k-1}^{-1}P_{k-1})(\xi)) = I$, we find that $J_{22}\lim_{\xi\to\infty}(\xi H_{22}(\xi)) = I$, which implies that J_{22} is nonsingular. By letting $K \coloneqq J_{22}$, we obtain condition 1.

Condition 2 Since $Q_k^{-1}P_k(\xi) = P_{k-1}^{-1}Q_{k-1}(\xi) - \operatorname{diag}\begin{pmatrix}0 & K\xi\end{pmatrix}$, then $Q_k^{-1}P_k$ is proper and positive-real by [2, Theorem 8.4.3], and $\lim_{\xi\to\infty}((Q_k^{-1}P_k)(\xi))$ is equal to the matrix $\hat{D}$ in (36). Then, the top left block in the equation $I = \lim_{\xi\to\infty}((P_{k-1}^{-1}Q_{k-1}Q_{k-1}^{-1}P_{k-1})(\xi))$ gives $\hat{D}_{11} = I_{r_{k-1}}$. Next, note that $\begin{bmatrix}P_k & -Q_k\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}P_{k-1} & -Q_{k-1}\end{bmatrix}S$ where

$$S = \begin{bmatrix}S_{11} & -I\\ -I & 0\end{bmatrix}, \text{ with } S_{11}(\xi) = \begin{bmatrix}0 & 0\\ 0 & -K\xi\end{bmatrix}.$$

It can be verified that S satisfies the conditions of note A2, whence (P_k, Q_k) is a positive-real pair. Finally, that $\deg(\det(Q_k)) < \deg(\det(Q_{k-1}))$ will follow from condition 3a, noting from the final two block columns in (S1) that $\deg(\det(Q_i)) = \det(\det(\mathcal{A}_i))$.

Condition 3 Let $\mathcal{A}_k, M_k, N_k, U_k, V_k, E_k, F_k$ be as in (S1) for the case $i = k$, partition these matrices compatibly as

$$\left[\begin{array}{cc|c} \hat{M}_{11} & \hat{M}_{12} & \hat{N}_1 \\ \hat{M}_{21} & \hat{M}_{22} & \hat{N}_2 \\ \hline \hat{U}_1 & \hat{U}_2 & \hat{V} \end{array}\right], \text{ and } \left[\begin{array}{cc|c|c} -I & -\hat{D}_{12} & I & -\hat{C}_1 \\ -\hat{D}_{21} & -\hat{D}_{22} & & -\hat{C}_2 \\ \hline -\hat{B}_1 & -\hat{B}_2 & 0 & \mathcal{A}_k \end{array}\right],$$

and let

$$\left[\begin{array}{cc} M_{k-1} & N_{k-1} \\ U_{k-1} & V_{k-1} \end{array}\right] = \left[\begin{array}{cc|cc} \hat{M}_{11} & \hat{M}_{12} & \hat{N}_1 & 0 \\ \hat{M}_{21} & \hat{M}_{22} & \hat{N}_2 & 0 \\ \hline -\hat{U}_1 & -\hat{U}_2 & -\hat{V} & 0 \\ 0 & I & 0 & -I \end{array}\right] \left[\begin{array}{cc|cc} I & \hat{D}_{12} & 0 & 0 \\ \hat{D}_{21} & \hat{D}_{22}+K\xi & 0 & I \\ \hline \hat{B}_1 & \hat{B}_2 & -I & 0 \\ \hat{D}_{21} & \hat{D}_{22}+K(1+\xi) & 0 & I \end{array}\right].$$

It can be verified that each of the above matrices is unimodular (the modulus of the determinant of the righmost matrix is equal to $\det(K)$). Also, with $E_{k-1} \coloneqq \operatorname{col}\begin{pmatrix} F_k & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $F_{k-1} \coloneqq \operatorname{col}\begin{pmatrix} E_k & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \operatorname{col}\begin{pmatrix} \hat{U}_2 & I \end{pmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} 0 & K \end{bmatrix}$, it can be verified that (S1) holds for $i = k-1$. Now, let L_{k-1}, W_{k-1} be as in condition 3b. Since $W_{k-1}^T W_{k-1} = D + D^T = \operatorname{diag}\begin{pmatrix} 2I_{r_{k-1}} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, then $\tilde{W}_2^T \tilde{W}_2 = 0$, which proves 3b(i). To show 3b(ii), we partition X_{k-1} compatibly with A_{k-1} as

$$X_{k-1} = \begin{bmatrix} X_{11} & X_{12} \\ X_{12}^T & X_{22} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since $C_{k-1}^T - X_{k-1}B_{k-1} = L_{k-1}^T W_{k-1} = \begin{bmatrix} L_{k-1}^T \tilde{W}_1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, then $X_{12} = 0$ and $X_{22} = K^{-1}$. Now, note that

$$\left[\begin{array}{cc|cc} \mathcal{A}_k(\xi) & -\hat{B}_1 & -\hat{B}_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -I \\ \hline L_k & \hat{W}_1 & \hat{W}_2 & 0 \end{array}\right] = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{A}_{k-1}(\xi) & -B_{k-1} \\ L_{k-1} & W_{k-1} \end{bmatrix} \left[\begin{array}{cc|cc} I & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & K & 0 \\ \hline \hat{C}_1 & I & \hat{D}_{12} & 0 \\ \hat{C}_2 & \hat{D}_{21} & \xi K+\hat{D}_{22} & I \end{array}\right]. \quad (37)$$

We denote the rightmost matrix in this equation by S, we let $\Omega_{k-1}(X_{k-1})$ and $\Omega_k(X_k)$ be as in (S3), and by direct calculation we obtain $S^T \Omega_{k-1}(X_{k-1}) S = \operatorname{diag}\begin{pmatrix} \Omega_k(X_k) & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. This proves 3b(iii). Condition 3b(iv) then follows since the rightmost matrix in (37) is nonsingular.

Next, let $X_k, L_k, W_k, X_{k-1}, L_{k-1}$ and W_{k-1} be as in condition 3c. We recall that the rightmost matrix in equation (37) (denoted S) is nonsingular. In particular,

$$S^{-1} = \left[\begin{array}{cc|cc} I & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\hat{C}_1 & -\hat{D}_{12}K^{-1} & I & 0 \\ \hline 0 & K^{-1} & 0 & 0 \\ \hat{D}_{21}\hat{C}_1-\hat{C}_2 & (\hat{D}_{21}\hat{D}_{12}-\hat{D}_{22})K^{-1}-\xi I & -\hat{D}_{21} & I \end{array}\right].$$

We find that $\Omega_{k-1}(X_{k-1}) = (S^{-1})^T \operatorname{diag}\begin{pmatrix} \Omega_k(X_k) & 0 \end{pmatrix} S^{-1}$, so 3c(i) holds, and 3c(ii) follows since S^{-1} is nonsingular. ■

We conclude this section with a remark about computing the optimal control.

Remark 25: If $\mathcal{B}_s$ in (1) satisfies $m = n$, $D+D^T > 0$ and $A_\Gamma(X_-)$ in Theorem 12 satisfies $\operatorname{spec}(A_\Gamma(X_-)) \in \mathbb{C}_-$, then $\mathbf{u} \coloneqq -(D+D^T)^{-1}(C-B^T X_-)\mathbf{x}$ and $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_s$ imply

$$-\int_{t_0}^{t_1} (\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{y})(t)dt = -\tfrac{1}{2}\left[(\mathbf{x}^T X_- \mathbf{x})(t)\right]_{t_0}^{t_1} \text{ and } \tfrac{d\mathbf{x}}{dt} = A_\Gamma(X_-)\mathbf{x}.$$

Thus, if $\mathbf{x}(t_0) = \mathbf{x}_0$, then $-\int_{t_0}^{\infty} (\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{y})(t)dt = S_a^{\sigma_p}(\mathbf{x}_0)$.

If, on the other hand, $D+D^T$ is singular or $\operatorname{spec}(A_\Gamma(X_-)) \not\subset \mathbb{C}_-$, then there still exists a linear state feedback law such that, with $\mathbf{x}_0 \coloneqq \mathbf{x}(t_0)$, then $-\int_{t_0}^{\infty} (\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{y})(t)dt$ comes arbitrarily close to the supremum $S_a^{\sigma_p}(\mathbf{x}_0)$. This can be constructed as follows. First, it follows from Lemmas 17 and 18 that no generality is lost in assuming (C, A) is observable. We then let $\epsilon > 0$, and we note that $(I + \epsilon D)$ is necessarily invertible. Then, let

$$A_\epsilon \coloneqq A - B(I+\epsilon D)^{-1}\epsilon C,\ B_\epsilon \coloneqq B(I+\epsilon D)^{-1}\sqrt{1+\epsilon^2},$$
$$C_\epsilon \coloneqq \tfrac{(1-\epsilon^2)}{\sqrt{1+\epsilon^2}}(I+\epsilon D)^{-1}C,\ D_\epsilon \coloneqq (D+\epsilon I)(I+\epsilon D)^{-1}, \text{ and}$$
$$\mathcal{B}_s^\epsilon \coloneqq \{(\mathbf{u}_\epsilon, \mathbf{y}_\epsilon, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{L}_2^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{L}_2^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \times AC\left(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d\right) \mid \tfrac{d\mathbf{x}}{dt} = A_\epsilon \mathbf{x} + B_\epsilon \mathbf{u}_\epsilon, \mathbf{y}_\epsilon = C_\epsilon \mathbf{x} + D_\epsilon \mathbf{u}_\epsilon\},$$

so $\mathbf{u}_\epsilon = (\mathbf{u} + \epsilon \mathbf{y})/\sqrt{1+\epsilon^2}$ and $\mathbf{y}_\epsilon = (\mathbf{y} + \epsilon \mathbf{u})/\sqrt{1+\epsilon^2}$ satisfy

$$\int_{t_0}^{t_1} (\mathbf{u}_\epsilon^T \mathbf{y}_\epsilon)(t)dt = \int_{t_0}^{t_1} (\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{y})(t)dt + \tfrac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{1-\epsilon^2}} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} (\mathbf{u}_\epsilon^T \mathbf{u}_\epsilon + \mathbf{y}_\epsilon^T \mathbf{y}_\epsilon)(t)dt,$$

and $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_s$ if and only if $(\mathbf{u}_\epsilon, \mathbf{y}_\epsilon, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_s^\epsilon$. Also, with $G(\xi) \coloneqq D + C(\xi I - A)^{-1}B$ and $G_\epsilon(\xi) \coloneqq D_\epsilon + C_\epsilon(\xi I - A_\epsilon)^{-1}B_\epsilon$, then $G_\epsilon = (G + \epsilon I)(I + \epsilon G)^{-1}$. It can then be verified that $G_\epsilon(j\omega) + G_\epsilon(-j\omega)^T > 0$ for all $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$, $D_\epsilon + D_\epsilon^T > 0$, and G_ϵ has no poles in $\bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$. Since, in addition, (C, A) is observable and (A, B) is stabilizable, then it can be shown that $\operatorname{spec}(A_\epsilon) \in \mathbb{C}_-$. It then follows from [12] that there exists $X_-^\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_s^{d \times d}$ such that

$$-A_\epsilon^T X_-^\epsilon - X_-^\epsilon A_\epsilon - (C_\epsilon^T - X_-^\epsilon B_\epsilon)(D_\epsilon + D_\epsilon^T)^{-1}(C_\epsilon - B_\epsilon^T X_-^\epsilon) = 0,$$
$$\text{and } \operatorname{spec}(A_\epsilon - B_\epsilon(D_\epsilon + D_\epsilon^T)^{-1}(C_\epsilon - B_\epsilon^T X_-^\epsilon)) \in \mathbb{C}_-,$$

and it follows that if $\mathbf{u}_\epsilon \coloneqq -(D_\epsilon + D_\epsilon^T)^{-1}(C_\epsilon - B_\epsilon^T X_-^\epsilon)\mathbf{x}$ and $(\mathbf{u}_\epsilon, \mathbf{y}_\epsilon, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_s^\epsilon$, then $\mathbf{x}(t) \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$, and $-\int_{t_0}^{\infty} (\mathbf{u}_\epsilon^T \mathbf{y}_\epsilon)(t)dt = \mathbf{x}(t_0)^T X_-^\epsilon \mathbf{x}(t_0)$. Thus, if $\mathbf{u} = (I + \epsilon D)^{-1}(\sqrt{1+\epsilon^2}\mathbf{u}_\epsilon - \epsilon C\mathbf{x})$ and $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_s$, then $\mathbf{u}_\epsilon = (\mathbf{u} + \epsilon \mathbf{y})/\sqrt{1+\epsilon^2}$ and $\mathbf{y}_\epsilon = (\mathbf{y} + \epsilon \mathbf{u})/\sqrt{1+\epsilon^2}$, so $\mathbf{x}(t) \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$ and $-\int_{t_0}^{\infty} (\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{y})(t)dt \geq \mathbf{x}(t_0)^T X_-^\epsilon \mathbf{x}(t_0)$. Finally, it can be verified that $X_-^\epsilon \to X_-$ as $\epsilon \to 0$, so $-\int_{t_0}^{\infty} (\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{y})(t)dt$ can be made arbitrarily close to the supremum $S_a^{\sigma_p}(\mathbf{x}_0)$ by taking ϵ sufficiently small.

A similar argument holds for non-expansive behaviors. In this case, we let $A_\epsilon = A, B_\epsilon = B, C_\epsilon = (1-\epsilon)C, D_\epsilon = (1-\epsilon)D$.

VIII. Non-expansive systems and the available storage

To prove Theorem 6, we will employ transformations which relate non-expansive and passive systems, and similar transformations which relate positive-real and bounded-real pairs.

Proof of Theorem 6: We will first show the two chains of implications $1 \Rightarrow 4 \Rightarrow 3 \Rightarrow 1$, and $4 \Rightarrow 2 \Rightarrow 3$.

1 ⇒ 4 ⇒ 3 ⇒ 1 First, let $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and let $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(t) = e^{A(t-t_0)}\mathbf{z}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} = 0$, and $\tilde{\mathbf{y}} = C\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$. Then $(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \in \mathcal{B}_s$, $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(t_0) = \mathbf{z}$, and $\int_{t_0}^{t_1} (\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{u}})(t)dt \geq 0$. Second, note that $\int_{t_0}^{t_1} (\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{y})(t)dt - \left[\mathbf{x}^T X \mathbf{x}\right]_{t_0}^{t_1} = \int_{t_0}^{t_1} (\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}^T & \mathbf{u}^T \end{bmatrix} \Lambda(X) \operatorname{col}\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{u} \end{pmatrix})(t)dt$. With these two observations, the present implications can be shown in a similar manner to the corresponding implications in Theorem 10.

2 ⇒ 3 Consider the observer staircase form (see Lemma 17), and let

$$\hat{\Lambda}(\hat{X}) \coloneqq \begin{bmatrix} -\hat{A}_{11}^T \hat{X} - \hat{X}\hat{A}_{11} - \hat{C}_1^T \hat{C}_1 & -\hat{C}_1^T \hat{D} - \hat{X}\hat{B}_1 \\ -\hat{D}^T \hat{C}_1 - \hat{B}_1^T \hat{X} & I - \hat{D}^T \hat{D} \end{bmatrix}.$$

If there exists a $\hat{X} \in \mathbb{R}_s^{\hat{d}\times\hat{d}}$ satisfying $\hat{X} \geq 0$ and $\hat{\Lambda}(\hat{X}) \geq 0$, then $X \coloneqq T^T \mathrm{diag}\begin{pmatrix}\hat{X} & 0\end{pmatrix} T$ satisfies $X \geq 0$ and $\Lambda(X) \geq 0$. Thus, it suffices to prove this implication for the case with (C, A) observable. We will prove this for the cases: (i) $m = n$, (ii) $n < m$, and (iii) $m < n$.

Case (i): m = n Let $\mathcal{A}(\xi) \coloneqq \xi I - A$, and let M, N, U, V, E, F be polynomial matrices as in Lemma 20. From note A4, there exists a signature matrix Σ and matrices

$$\hat{Q} \coloneqq \tfrac{1}{2}(Q - P\Sigma) \text{ and } \hat{P} \coloneqq \tfrac{1}{2}(P\Sigma + Q) \tag{38}$$

such that $\hat{Q}$ is nonsingular and $\hat{Q}^{-1}\hat{P}$ is proper. Now, let $D \coloneqq \lim_{\xi\to\infty}(Q^{-1}P(\xi))$ and $\hat{D} \coloneqq \lim_{\xi\to\infty}(\hat{Q}^{-1}\hat{P}(\xi))$. Note that $(I - Q^{-1}P\Sigma)\hat{Q}^{-1}\hat{P} = I + Q^{-1}P\Sigma$, so by taking the limit as $\xi \to \infty$ we obtain $(I - D\Sigma)\hat{D} = I + D\Sigma$. Thus, if $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\mathbf{z}^T(I - D\Sigma) = 0$, then $\mathbf{z}^T(I + D\Sigma) = 0$, so $\mathbf{z} = 0$. Hence, $(I - D\Sigma)$ is nonsingular, and

$$\hat{D} = (I - D\Sigma)^{-1}(I + D\Sigma) = 2(I - D\Sigma)^{-1} - I. \tag{39}$$

Now, let

$$\begin{bmatrix}\hat{M} & \hat{N}\\ \hat{U} & \hat{V}\end{bmatrix} \coloneqq \begin{bmatrix}\frac{1}{2}I & 0\\ 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}I\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}M & N\\ U & V\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}I - D\Sigma & 0\\ -B\Sigma & \sqrt{2}I\end{bmatrix},$$

so all of the above matrices are unimodular. Then, with

$$\begin{aligned}&\hat{A} \coloneqq A + B\Sigma(I - D\Sigma)^{-1}C, \;\; \hat{B} \coloneqq \sqrt{2}B\Sigma(I - D\Sigma)^{-1},\\ &\hat{C} \coloneqq \sqrt{2}(I - D\Sigma)^{-1}C, \;\; \hat{\mathcal{A}}(\xi) \coloneqq \xi I - \hat{A},\\ &\hat{E} \coloneqq \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(E\Sigma - F), \text{ and } \hat{F} \coloneqq \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(E\Sigma + F),\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

it can be verified that $(\hat{C}, \hat{A})$ is observable, and

$$\begin{bmatrix}\hat{M} & \hat{N}\\ \hat{U} & \hat{V}\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}-\hat{D} & I & -\hat{C}\\ -\hat{B} & 0 & \hat{\mathcal{A}}\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}-\hat{P} & \hat{Q} & 0\\ -\hat{E} & -\hat{F} & I\end{bmatrix}. \tag{41}$$

Hence, $(\hat{A}, \hat{B}, \hat{C}, \hat{D})$ is an observable realization for $(\hat{P}, \hat{Q})$ (see Lemma 20). Since $\hat{Q} \coloneqq \frac{1}{2}(Q - P\Sigma)$ and $\hat{P} \coloneqq \frac{1}{2}(P\Sigma + Q)$, then it follows from notes A2–A4 that $(\hat{P}, \hat{Q})$ is a positive-real pair. Thus, from Lemma 4 and Theorem 10, there exists $X \in \mathbb{R}_s^{d\times d}$ such that $X > 0$ and

$$\hat{\Omega}(X) \coloneqq \begin{bmatrix}-\hat{A}^T X - X\hat{A} & \hat{C}^T - X\hat{B}\\ \hat{C} - \hat{B}^T X & \hat{D} + \hat{D}^T\end{bmatrix} \tag{42}$$

satisfies $\hat{\Omega}(X) \geq 0$. Furthermore, with

$$S = \begin{bmatrix}I & 0\\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}C & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(I - D\Sigma)\Sigma\end{bmatrix}, \tag{43}$$

then it can be verified that $S^T\hat{\Omega}(X)S = \Lambda(X)$, which is non-negative definite since $\hat{\Omega}(X)$ is. This proves case (i).

Case (ii): m > n Let $\hat{P} \coloneqq \begin{bmatrix}P & 0_{m\times(m-n)}\end{bmatrix}$ and $\hat{Q} \coloneqq Q$. It is easily shown from note A1 that $(\hat{P}, \hat{Q})$ is a bounded-real pair. Also, with $\hat{A}{=}A$, $\hat{B}{=}\begin{bmatrix}B & 0_{d\times(m-n)}\end{bmatrix}$, $\hat{C}{=}C$, and $\hat{D}{=}\begin{bmatrix}D & 0_{m\times(m-n)}\end{bmatrix}$, it can be verified that (A, B, C, D) is an observable realization for (P, Q) if and only if $(\hat{A}, \hat{B}, \hat{C}, \hat{D})$ is an observable realization for $(\hat{P}, \hat{Q})$. With

$$\hat{\Lambda}(X) \coloneqq \begin{bmatrix}-\hat{A}^T X - X\hat{A} - \hat{C}^T\hat{C} & -\hat{C}^T\hat{D} - X\hat{B}\\ -\hat{D}^T\hat{C} - \hat{B}^T X & I - \hat{D}^T\hat{D}\end{bmatrix}, \tag{44}$$

then $\hat{\Lambda}(X) = \mathrm{diag}\begin{pmatrix}\Lambda(X) & I\end{pmatrix}$. From case (i), there exists $X > 0$ such that $\hat{\Lambda}(X) \geq 0$. This X also satisfies $\Lambda(X) \geq 0$.

Case (iii): m < n . In this case, let $\hat{P} \coloneqq \mathrm{col}\begin{pmatrix}P & 0_{(n-m)\times n}\end{pmatrix}$, $\hat{Q} \coloneqq \mathrm{diag}\begin{pmatrix}Q & I_{(n-m)\times(n-m)}\end{pmatrix}$, $\hat{A}{=}A$, $\hat{B}{=}B$, $\hat{C}{=}\mathrm{col}\begin{pmatrix}C & 0_{(n-m)\times d}\end{pmatrix}$, and $\hat{D}{=}\mathrm{col}\begin{pmatrix}D & 0_{(n-m)\times n}\end{pmatrix}$; and let $\Lambda(X)$ and $\hat{\Lambda}(X)$ be as in (6) and (44), respectively. Then $(\hat{P}, \hat{Q})$ is a bounded-real pair (this is easily shown from note A1), $\Lambda(X) = \hat{\Lambda}(X)$, and the proof is similar to case (ii).

4 ⇒ 2 We will prove this for the two cases (i) (C, A) observable; and (ii) (C, A) not observable.

Case (i): (C, A) observable We consider the case $m = n$. The proofs for the cases $m > n$ and $m < n$ are then similar to the corresponding cases in the proof of 2 ⇒ 3. Let $\Sigma, \hat{P}, \hat{Q}, \hat{A}, \hat{B}, \hat{C}, \hat{D}$, and $\hat{\Omega}(X)$ be as in case (i) for the proof of 2 ⇒ 3. Then, from that proof, $(\hat{A}, \hat{B}, \hat{C}, \hat{D})$ is an observable realization of $(\hat{P}, \hat{Q})$, and $\hat{\Omega}(X_-) \geq 0$. Thus, $(\hat{P}, \hat{Q})$ is a positive-real pair by Theorem 10, so (P, Q) is a bounded-real pair by notes A2–A4.

Case (ii): (C, A) not observable Consider the observer staircase form (see Lemma 17), and let $\hat{\Lambda}$ be as in (44). Then $X_- = T^T\mathrm{diag}\begin{pmatrix}\hat{X}_- & 0\end{pmatrix} T$ where $\hat{X}_- \in \mathbb{R}_s^{\hat{d}\times\hat{d}}$ satisfies $\hat{\Lambda}(\hat{X}_-) \geq 0$ and $\hat{X}_- \geq 0$. Furthermore, with $\hat{\mathcal{B}}_s$ as in Lemma 17, then $\mathcal{B}_s^{(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y})} = \hat{\mathcal{B}}_s^{(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{y})}$ by that lemma. Condition 2 then follows from case (i).

It remains to prove conditions (i) and (ii) in the final paragraph of the present theorem statement. To see (i), let $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$ and $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^d$ satisfy $(\lambda I - A)\mathbf{z} = 0$, and note that $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^T(A^T X + XA)\mathbf{z} = (\lambda + \bar{\lambda})\bar{\mathbf{z}}^T X\mathbf{z}$. Then $0 \leq \bar{\mathbf{z}}^T C^T C\mathbf{z} \leq -2\Re(\lambda)\bar{\mathbf{z}}^T X\mathbf{z} \leq 0$, so $C\mathbf{z} = 0$. If (C, A) is observable, then $\mathbf{z} = 0$, so $\mathrm{spec}(A) \in \mathbb{C}_-$. The proof of condition (ii) follows a similar argument to the corresponding condition in Theorem 10, using the observations in the second paragraph of the proof of this theorem. ∎

IX. Explicit characterisation of the available storage for a non-expansive system

This section contains the proofs of Theorems 7 and 8. The proofs provide methods for calculating the available storage for a non-expansive system by using the results in Section VII.

Proof of Theorem 7: **2 ⇒ 1** This follows from Theorem 6, since $X_- \geq 0$ and $\Lambda(X_-) \geq 0$.

1 ⇒ 2 First, we note from Theorem 6 that (P, Q) is a bounded-real pair since $S_a^{\sigma_g}(\mathbf{x}_0) < \infty$. We will show that this implies condition 2 for the cases: (i) (C, A) observable and $m = n$; (ii) (C, A) observable and $m > n$; (iii) (C, A) observable and $m < n$; then finally (iv) (C, A) not observable.

Case (i) (C, A) observable, m = n Let $\Sigma, \hat{P}, \hat{Q}, \hat{A}, \hat{B}, \hat{C}$, and $\hat{D}$ be as in case (i) in the proof of 2 ⇒ 3 in Theorem 6. From that proof, $(\hat{P}, \hat{Q})$ is a positive-real pair, and $(\hat{A}, \hat{B}, \hat{C}, \hat{D})$ is an observable realization of $(\hat{P}, \hat{Q})$. From Theorem 12, with the notation

$$\begin{aligned}&\hat{\Gamma}(X) \coloneqq -\hat{A}^T X - X\hat{A} - (\hat{C}^T - X\hat{B})(\hat{D} + \hat{D}^T)^{-1}(\hat{C} - \hat{B}^T X),\\ &\text{and } A_{\hat{\Gamma}}(X) \coloneqq \hat{A} - \hat{B}(\hat{D} + \hat{D}^T)^{-1}(\hat{C} - \hat{B}^T X),\end{aligned}$$

there exists $X \in \mathbb{R}_s^{d\times d}$ such that $X \geq 0$, $\hat{\Gamma}(X) = 0$, and $\mathrm{spec}(A_{\hat{\Gamma}}(X)) \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$. It can then be verified that $\Pi(X) = \hat{\Gamma}(X)$ and $A_\Pi(X) = A_{\hat{\Gamma}}(X)$, so condition 2 holds.

Case (ii) (C, A) observable, m > n Let $\hat{P}$, $\hat{Q}$, $\hat{A}, \hat{B}, \hat{C}$, and $\hat{D}$ be as in case (ii) in the proof of 2 $\Rightarrow$ 3 in Theorem 6; so $(\hat{P}, \hat{Q})$ is a bounded-real pair, and (A, B, C, D) is an observable realization for (P, Q) if and only if $(\hat{A}, \hat{B}, \hat{C}, \hat{D})$ is an observable realization for $(\hat{P}, \hat{Q})$. Also, let

$$\hat{\Pi}(X) \coloneqq -\hat{A}^T X - X\hat{A} - \hat{C}^T\hat{C} - (\hat{C}^T\hat{D} + X\hat{B})(I - \hat{D}^T\hat{D})^{-1}(\hat{D}^T\hat{C} + \hat{B}^T X), \quad (45)$$

$$\text{and } \hat{A}_{\hat{\Pi}}(X) \coloneqq \hat{A} + \hat{B}(I - \hat{D}^T\hat{D})^{-1}(\hat{D}^T\hat{C} + \hat{B}^T X). \quad (46)$$

It can be verified that $\hat{\Pi}(X) = \Pi(X)$ and $\hat{A}_{\hat{\Pi}}(X) = A_{\Pi}(X)$, so this case follows from case (i).

Case (iii) (C, A) observable, m < n In this case, we let $\hat{P}, \hat{Q}, \hat{A}, \hat{B}, \hat{C}$, and $\hat{D}$ be as in case (iii) in the proof of 2 $\Rightarrow$ 3 in Theorem 6. Then, with $\hat{\Pi}(X)$ and $\hat{A}_{\hat{\Pi}}(X)$ as in (45)–(46), we obtain $\hat{\Pi}(X) = \Pi(X)$ and $\hat{A}_{\hat{\Pi}}(X) = A_{\Pi}(X)$. The proof then follows the argument in case (ii).

Case (iv) (C, A) not observable This can be proved in the manner of case (ii) in the proof of 1 $\Rightarrow$ 2 in Theorem 12.

Finally, with a similar proof to the corresponding implication in Theorem 12, we find that if X_- satisfies condition 2 of the present theorem, then $S_a^{\sigma_g}(\mathbf{x}_0) = \mathbf{x}_0^T X_- \mathbf{x}_0$. ∎

Proof of Theorem 8: **2 $\Rightarrow$ 1** This follows from Theorem 6, since $X_- \geq 0$ and $\Lambda(X_-) \geq 0$.

For the remainder of the proof, we let (C, A) be observable and $m = n$. The cases $m > n$ and $m < n$ can be shown by augmenting to the case $m = n$ as in the proof of Theorem 7. The case (C, A) not observable can be shown with a similar argument to the corresponding implication in Theorem 13.

1 $\Rightarrow$ 2 Since $S_a^{\sigma_g}(\mathbf{x}_0) < \infty$ for all $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then (P, Q) is a bounded-real pair by Theorem 6. Next, let $\Sigma, \hat{P}, \hat{Q}, \hat{A}, \hat{B}, \hat{C}$, and $\hat{D}$ be as in case (i) in the proof of 2 $\Rightarrow$ 3 in Theorem 6 (so $I - D\Sigma$ is nonsingular and $(\hat{C}, \hat{A})$ is observable), and let $\hat{G}(\xi) \coloneqq \hat{D} + \hat{C}(\xi I - \hat{A})^{-1}\hat{B}$. Then $(\hat{P}, \hat{Q})$ is a positive-real pair, so from Theorems 10 and 13 there exist real matrices $X_-, \hat{L}$, and $\hat{W}$ with $X_- \geq 0$ such that

(a) $-\hat{A}^T X_- - X_-\hat{A} = \hat{L}^T\hat{L}$, $\hat{C} - \hat{B}^T X_- = \hat{W}^T\hat{L}$, $\hat{D} + \hat{D}^T = \hat{W}^T\hat{W}$; and

(b) $\hat{Z}(\xi) \coloneqq \hat{W} + \hat{L}(\xi I - \hat{A})^{-1}\hat{B}$ is a spectral factor of $\hat{G} + \hat{G}^\star$.

Then, let

$$L \coloneqq \hat{L} - \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\hat{W}C \text{ and } W \coloneqq \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\hat{W}(I - D\Sigma)\Sigma,$$

and it can be verified that condition (iiia) holds. Also,

$$\begin{bmatrix} \lambda I - \hat{A} & -\hat{B} \\ \hat{L} & \hat{W} \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}C & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(I - D\Sigma)\Sigma \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda I - A & -B \\ L & W \end{bmatrix}.$$

From Theorem 10, $\text{spec}(\hat{A}) \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$. Also, from Theorem 6, $\text{spec}(A) \in \mathbb{C}_-$. Since, in addition, $(I - D\Sigma)$ is nonsingular, then a similar argument to the proof of Lemma 21 shows that Z is a spectral factor of $I - G^\star G$.

Finally, we prove that if X_- satisfies condition 2, then $S_a^{\sigma_g}(\mathbf{x}_0) = \mathbf{x}_0^T X_- \mathbf{x}_0$. It suffices to show that X_- is uniquely determined by condition 2. To show this, we let $\Sigma, \hat{P}, \hat{Q}, \hat{A}, \hat{B}, \hat{C}, \hat{D}$ and $\hat{G}$ be as in the previous paragraph. Following that paragraph, if X_- satisfies condition 2, then $\hat{L} \coloneqq L + W\Sigma(I - D\Sigma)^{-1}C$ and $\hat{W} \coloneqq \sqrt{2}W\Sigma(I - D\Sigma)^{-1}$ satisfy the aforementioned conditions (a) and (b). From Theorem 13, these conditions uniquely determine X_-. ∎

REFERENCES

[1] J. C. Willems, "Dissipative dynamical systems, Part II: Linear systems with quadratic supply rates," *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, vol. 45, pp. 352–393, 1972.

[2] B. D. O. Anderson and S. Vongpanitlerd, *Network Analysis and Synthesis*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

[3] B. P. Molinari, "The time-invariant linear-quadratic optimal control problem," *Automatica*, vol. 13, pp. 345–357, 1977.

[4] T. H. Hughes, "A theory of passive linear systems with no assumptions," *Automatica, provisionally accepted (pre-print: https://arxiv.org/abs/1611.06140)*, 2016.

[5] B. Brogliato, R. Lozano, B. Maschke, and O. Egeland, *Dissipative Systems Analysis and Control*. London : Springer-Verlag, 2007.

[6] J. W. Polderman and J. C. Willems, *Introduction to Mathematical Systems Theory: A Behavioral Approach*. New York : Springer-Verlag, 1998.

[7] Y. Cheng, "Improvement of the ARE strict bounded real lemma," *Proceedings of the 21st Chinese Control and Decision Conference*, 2009.

[8] J. C. Doyle, K. Glover, P. P. Khargonekar, and B. A. Francis, "State-space solutions to standard $\mathscr{H}_2$ and $\mathscr{H}_\infty$ control problems," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, vol. 34, no. 8, pp. 831 – 847, August 1989.

[9] T. H. Hughes, "Behavioral realizations using companion matrices and the Smith form," *SIAM Journal on Control Optim.*, vol. 54, no. 2, pp. 845–865, 2016.

[10] M. K. Çamlibel, L. Iannelli, and F. Vasca, "Passivity and complemantarity," *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 145, no. 1-2, pp. 531–563, 2014.

[11] J. Collado, R. Lozano, and R. Johansson, "On Kalman-Yakubovich-Popov lemma for stabilizable systems," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, vol. 46, no. 7, pp. 1089–1093, July 2001.

[12] W. Sun, P. P. Khargonekar, and D. Shim, "Solution of the positive real control problem for linear time-invariant systems," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, vol. 39, no. 10, pp. 2034–2046, October 1994.

[13] L. Pandolfi, "An observation on the positive real lemma," *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, vol. 255, no. 2, pp. 480–490, Mar 2001.

[14] S. Kunimatsu, K. Sang-Hoon, T. Fujii, and M. Ishitobi, "On positive real lemma for non-minimal realization systems," *Proceedings of the 17th IFAC World Congress, Seoul*, pp. 5868–5873, 2008.

[15] A. Ferrante and L. Pandolfi, "On the solvability of the positive real lemma equations," *Systems and Control Letters*, vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 211–219, October 2002.

[16] A. Ferrante, "Positive real lemma: Necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of solutions under virtually no assumptions," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, vol. 50, pp. 720–724, May 2005.

[17] M. K. Çamlibel, J. C. Willems, and M. N. Belur, "On the dissipativity of uncontrollable systems," in *Proceedings of the 42nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, Hawaii*, Dec. 2003.

[18] D. Pal and M. N. Belur, "Dissipativity of uncontrollable systems, storage functions, and Lyapunov functions," *SIAM Journal on Control Optim.*, vol. 47, no. 6, pp. 2930–2966, 2008.

[19] B. D. O. Anderson and J. B. Moore, *Linear Optimal Control*. Prentice-Hall, 1971.

APPENDIX A
POSITIVE-REAL AND BOUNDED-REAL PAIRS

Here, we provide several results relating to the new concepts of positive-real and bounded-real pairs.

A1 Let $P \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}[\xi]$, $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m}[\xi]$, and let

$$J_n \coloneqq \frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_n \\ I_n & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Sigma_{m,n} \coloneqq \begin{bmatrix} I_n & 0 \\ 0 & -I_m \end{bmatrix}, \quad (47)$$

$$\Psi(\eta, \xi) \coloneqq \begin{bmatrix} P & -Q \end{bmatrix}(\eta)\Sigma_{m,n}\begin{bmatrix} P & -Q \end{bmatrix}(\xi)^T, \text{ and} \quad (48)$$

$$\Phi(\eta, \xi) \coloneqq \begin{bmatrix} P & -Q \end{bmatrix}(\eta)J_n\begin{bmatrix} P & -Q \end{bmatrix}^T(\xi) \text{ if } m = n. \quad (49)$$

Then (P, Q) is a positive-real pair (resp., bounded-real pair) if and only if (i) $\Phi(\lambda, \bar{\lambda}) \leq 0$ (resp., $\Psi(\lambda, \bar{\lambda}) \leq 0$) for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$; (ii) $\text{rank}(\begin{bmatrix} P & -Q \end{bmatrix}(\lambda)) = n$ for all $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$; and (iii) if $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^n[\xi]$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ satisfy $\mathbf{p}(\xi)^T\Phi(\xi, -\xi) = 0$ (resp., $\mathbf{p}(\xi)^T\Psi(\xi, -\xi) = 0$) and $\mathbf{p}(\lambda)^T\begin{bmatrix} P & -Q \end{bmatrix}(\lambda) = 0$, then $\mathbf{p}(\lambda) = 0$

A2 Let $P, Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}[\xi]$; let J_n be as in (47); let $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}[\xi]$ and $S \in \mathbb{R}^{2n\times 2n}[\xi]$ be unimodular with $SJ_nS^\star = J_n$; and let $\hat{P}, \hat{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}[\xi]$ satisfy $\begin{bmatrix}\hat{P} & -\hat{Q}\end{bmatrix} \coloneqq Y\begin{bmatrix}P & -Q\end{bmatrix}S$. Then (P, Q) is a positive-real pair if and only if $(\hat{P}, \hat{Q})$ is a positive-real pair (this follows from A1).

A3 Let $P, Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}[\xi]$; let J_n and $\Sigma_{n,n}$ be as in (47); let $S \in \mathbb{R}^{2n\times 2n}[\xi]$ be unimodular with $SJ_nS^\star = \Sigma_{n,n}$; and let $\hat{P}, \hat{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}[\xi]$ satisfy $\begin{bmatrix}\hat{P} & -\hat{Q}\end{bmatrix} \coloneqq \begin{bmatrix}P & -Q\end{bmatrix}S$. Then (P, Q) is a bounded-real pair if and only if $(\hat{P}, \hat{Q})$ is a positive-real pair (this also follows from A1).

A4 Let $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ be a signature matrix (i.e., Σ is diagonal with diagonal entries ± 1), let $P, Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}[\xi]$, and let $\hat{Q} \coloneqq \frac{1}{2}(Q - P\Sigma)$ and $\hat{P} \coloneqq \frac{1}{2}(P\Sigma + Q)$. Then (P, Q) is a bounded-real pair if and only if $(\hat{P}, \hat{Q})$ is a positive-real pair (this follows from A3). Also, if $P, Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}[\xi]$ and $Q^{-1}P$ is proper, then there necessarily exists a signature matrix Σ and matrices $\hat{Q} \coloneqq \frac{1}{2}(Q-P\Sigma)$ and $\hat{P} \coloneqq \frac{1}{2}(P\Sigma+Q)$ such that $\hat{Q}$ is nonsingular and $\hat{Q}^{-1}\hat{P}$ is proper. To obtain such matrices $\Sigma, \hat{P}$ and $\hat{Q}$, we let $\tilde{P} \coloneqq \frac{1}{2}(P + Q)$ and $\tilde{Q} \coloneqq \frac{1}{2}(Q - P)$, so $P = \tilde{P} - \tilde{Q}$ and $Q = \tilde{P} + \tilde{Q}$. We then let S_1 and $S_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ be matrices which select columns from $\tilde{P}$ and $\tilde{Q}$ to achieve the maximal determinantal degree. I.e., (i) S_1 and S_2 are diagonal matrices with all entries either 0 or 1; (ii) $S_1 + S_2 = I$; and (iii) $\deg(\det(\tilde{P}S_1 + \tilde{Q}S_2))$ takes its maximum value among all matrices S_1 and S_2 which satisfy (i) and (ii). We then let $\hat{P} \coloneqq \tilde{P}S_2 + \tilde{Q}S_1$, $\hat{Q} \coloneqq \tilde{P}S_1 + \tilde{Q}S_2$, and $\Sigma \coloneqq S_2 - S_1$, and we note that Σ is a signature matrix. That $\hat{Q}^{-1}\hat{P}$ is proper can be proved using the method in [4, Proof of Theorem 7].